

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers,
effective date of oath of office

Russell W. Hart.
Paul C. Henderson

To be scientist director, effective date of oath
of office

Ralph W. G. Wyckoff

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons

Leonard A. Scheele Alexander G. Gilliam
Warren P. Dearing James C. Archer

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant
surgeons

Robert L. Cannon Louis C. Floyd
Merle Bundy Fred W. Harb
Ira Avrin James L. Hart
Robert J. Huebner John W. Murray, Jr.
John K. McBane Arthur L. Koven
Griffith E. Quinby Leo P. Krall

Senior dental surgeon to be dental director
Ozias Paquin, Jr.

Senior assistant dental surgeons to be dental
surgeons

Bruce D. Forsyth Ralph S. Lloyd
John W. Knutson William P. Kroschel
George E. Jones

Sanitary engineers to be senior sanitary
engineers

Judson L. Robertson John J. Bloomfield
Charles T. Wright Henry A. Johnson

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 10, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5,
1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.,
on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown
Harris, D. D., offered the following
prayer:

Our gracious Father, as our thoughts
are hushed to silence, may we find Thee
moving upon our minds, higher than our
highest thought, yet nearer to us than
our very selves. Before the toil of a new
day opens before us, we lay before Thee
the meditations of our hearts. May they
be acceptable in Thy sight. Bring all our
desires and powers, we beseech Thee, into
conformity to Thy will.

As we pray for Thy kingdom's coming
to our own hearts and to the world, awake
in us a holy awe of this law-abiding
universe which is our home and which
so inexorably moves from cause to con-
sequence. Bend our pride to Thy con-
trol. Prepare us for the role committed
to our fallible hands in this appalling
day with its vast issues that concern not
only our own dear land but all the con-
tinents and the islands of the sea. May
our loins be girt and our lamps burning
and ourselves as men who watch for their
Lord's coming. In the Redeemer's name
we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unani-
mous consent, the reading of the Journal
of the proceedings of the calendar day
Saturday, June 8, 1946, was dispensed
with, and the Journal was approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on behalf
of the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr.
AIKEN], I ask unanimous consent that

he be excused from attendance upon the
session of today and also the session of
tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With-
out objection, leave is granted.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the Presi-
dent of the United States were commu-
nicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one
of his secretaries, and he announced that
on June 8, 1946, the President had ap-
proved and signed the following acts:

S. 1802. An act to provide for the deliv-
ery of custody of certain articles of historic in-
terest from the U. S. S. Nevada, and the
U. S. S. Wyoming, to the State of Nevada and
the State of Wyoming, respectively;

S. 1862. An act to repeal section 1548 Re-
vised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 592); and

S. 1872. An act to provide for the rank of
original appointments in the Corps of Civil
Engineers of the United States Navy, and for
other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a
quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The
clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the
following Senators answered to their
names:

Andrews	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Austin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Overton
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Bilbo	Hoye	Radcliffe
Bridges	Huffman	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bushfield	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Stanfill
Capehart	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
George	Maybank	Walsh
Guffey	Millikin	Wherry
Gurney	Moore	White
Hart	Murdock	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Sena-
tor from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]
and the Senator from Alabama [Mr.
BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CAR-
VILLE] and the Senators from Idaho
[Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR] are ab-
sent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr.
BRIGGS] is absent because of a death in
his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr.
GERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr.
CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana
[Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New
York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from
Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Sena-
tor from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the
Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS],
and the Senator from Montana [Mr.
WHEELER] are detained on public
business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr.
FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode
Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official
business, attending the meeting of the
Empire Parliamentary Association at
Bermuda.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MC-
FARLAND] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from
Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Sena-
tor from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are ab-
sent by leave of the Senate as members
of the committee appointed by the
United States Senate to attend the Em-
pire Parliamentary Conference in Ber-
muda.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr.
AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr.
BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware
[Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Oregon
[Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Vir-
ginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from
New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator
from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are neces-
sarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUT-
LER], the Senator from North Dakota
[Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minne-
sota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator
from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are ab-
sent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire
[Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official
business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore.
Sixty-five Senators having answered to
their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid be-
fore the Senate the following commu-
nication and letters, which were referred
as indicated:

RESCISSIONS OF PORTIONS OF WAR AND WAR- RELATED APPROPRIATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 645)

A communication from the President of
the United States, transmitting proposed
rescissions of portions of several war and
war-related appropriations available for the
fiscal year 1946 (with accompanying papers);
to the Committee on Appropriations and
ordered to be printed.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the
Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies
of legislation passed by the Municipal Coun-
cils of St. Croix and St. Thomas and St. John,
V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the
Committee on Territories and Insular Af-
fairs.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON GOVERNMENT- OWNED SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANTS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Administration of War
Assets Administration, transmitting, pursu-
ant to law, the first supplementary report
with respect to Government-owned syn-
thetic rubber plants and facilities (with an
accompanying report); to the Committee on
Military Affairs.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Sen-
ate, or presented, and referred as indi-
cated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Chester J. Polston, of
Louisville, Ky., praying for the enactment
of legislation to extend the Office of Price
Administration; ordered to lie on the table.

A petition of sundry members of the Third
Battalion Medical Section, One Hundred and
Eighty-seventh Airborne, R. C. T., San Fran-
cisco, Calif., praying for the enactment of
legislation extending the Selective Training
and Service Act; to the Committee on Mil-
itary Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition, from
Mrs. Edythe Griffin, of Warrenton, Fla., pray-
ing for the enactment of legislation increas-
ing the pensions of widows of World War I

veterans from \$38 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Baltimore and Denton, Md., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 599, to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in newspapers, periodicals, and motion pictures, and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2264. A bill to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters; without amendment (Rept. No. 1437).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 776. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1439).

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. FULBRIGHT), from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 3517. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1440).

By Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 2122. A bill to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1441).

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1947—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1436) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, along with the bill, I submit a notice in writing to suspend the rule, which may not be necessary, but I give notice of my intention to do so as a protection in case such action is necessary.

The notice submitted by Mr. TYDINGS is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

Page 2, beginning in line 1, insert the following:

"There shall be paid to each Senator after January 1, 1946, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments. For making such payments through June 30, 1947, \$360,000, of which so much as is required to make such payments for the period from January

1, 1946, to June 30, 1946, both inclusive, shall be immediately available."

Mr. TYDINGS also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6429, the legislative appropriation bill, fiscal year 1947, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For the text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE BENEFITS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments, all of which are clarifying, the bill (S. 2204) to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of that act to survivors of veterans of World War II, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1438) thereon.

It will be my purpose to ask for consideration of the bill, which I do not think will take much time of the Senate, at some suitable and opportune moment. The bill is to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of that act to survivors of veterans of World War II, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

CLARA E. WASHINGTON

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 189, which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Senate to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Clara E. Washington, widow of Cosby F. Washington, late an employee of the Senate restaurant, a sum equal to 6 months' basic compensation, and I request its immediate consideration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there is so much confusion in the Chamber it is difficult to hear the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution is simply to pay the widow of a deceased Senate restaurant employee a sum equal to 6 months of his basic compensation.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 189) submitted by Mr. RADCLIFFE on November 9, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Clara E. Washington, widow of Cosby F. Washington, late an employee of the Senate Restaurant, a sum equal to 6 months' basic compensation at the rate he was receiving from such restaurant at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. GEORGE introduced Senate bill S. 2320, to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2321. A bill to amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, so as to exempt from the tax imposed by such section the transportation of persons by certain aircraft not operated on established routes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HART (by request):

S. 2322. A bill for the relief of Archer F. Hallett, of New Haven, Conn., as administrator of the estate of Kenneth M. Hallett, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TUNNELL (for himself, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. BRIGGS):

S. 2323. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, the purpose of which is to amend the Public Health Service Act in certain respects. I present with the bill an accompanying letter from the Federal Security Agency which goes into rather full explanation of the bill. I ask that the bill, together with the letter, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point, and that the bill may be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2320) to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GEORGE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) is amended by inserting immediately before the word "and" at the end of paragraph (j) the words "isonipocaine and its derivatives, compounds, salts, and preparations."

Sec. 2. (a) The title of section 207 of such act is amended to read "Assignments to Certain Positions."

(b) Subsection (a) of such section is amended to read:

"(a) When necessary for the accomplishment of important temporary work the Administrator may establish special temporary positions in the Service at the grade of Assistant Surgeon General. Not more than three such positions shall exist at any one time. Any officer of the Regular or Reserve Corps in the full grade or above may be assigned to any such position by the Surgeon General, and while so assigned such officer shall have the grade of Assistant Surgeon General and shall receive the pay and allowance applicable to such grade."

(c) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection

(c), by amending the second sentence of such subsection to read "Such assignments shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), affect the pay of commissioned officers so assigned," and by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) Any commissioned officer below the grade of director who is assigned to serve as chief of a division shall, for the duration of such assignment, have the grade of director and receive the pay and allowances applicable to such grade. Regulations of the President may prescribe the grades which shall be applicable to other specified positions; and any commissioned officer of a lower grade assigned or detailed to any such position shall, for the duration of such assignment or detail, have the grade so prescribed and receive the pay and allowances applicable to such grade."

Sec. 3. (a) The second sentence of paragraph (2) of section 208 (a) of such act is amended to read "Reserve commissions shall be for a period of not more than 5 years and may be terminated at any time, as the President may direct."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 208 of such act is amended to read:

"(b) Not more than 10 percent of the original appointments to the Regular Corps authorized to be made during any fiscal year may be made at grades above that of senior assistant but no such appointment may be made to a grade above that of director. For the purpose of this subsection the number of original appointments authorized to be made during a fiscal year shall be (1) the excess of the number of officers of the Regular Corps authorized by the appropriation act or acts for such year over the number of officers on active duty in the Regular Corps on the first day of such year, plus (2) the number of such officers, who during such fiscal year, have been or will be retired upon attainment of age 64 or have for any other reason ceased to be on active duty. In determining the number of appointments authorized by this subsection an appointment shall be deemed to be made in the fiscal year in which the nomination is transmitted by the President to the Senate. No person shall be appointed pursuant to this subsection unless he meets standards established in accordance with regulations of the President. For purposes of pay and pay period, any person appointed under the provisions of this subsection shall be considered as having had on the date of appointment service equal to that of the junior officer of the grade to which appointed, except that, if the active commissioned service in the service of any officer so appointed to the full grade exceeds that of the junior officer of such grade, such service (not exceeding 14 years) shall be credited for purposes of pay and pay period."

(c) Section 208 of such act is further amended by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) thereof as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively; by changing "subsection (c)" to "subsection (d)" and changing "subsection (d)" to subsection (e)" in the subsection hereby designated as subsection (f); and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) Commissions evidencing the appointment by the President of officers of the Regular or Reserve Corps shall be issued by the Administrator, under the seal of the Federal Security Agency."

(d) Section 208 of the Public Health Service Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Except as may be required by regulations, renewal of the oath of office shall not be required of an officer of the Regular Corps on account of any change in grade, or of an officer on active duty in the Reserve Corps on account of appointment to the Regular Corps

or to a different grade in the Reserve Corps, if the period of active service of such officer has been continuous."

Sec. 4. Subsection (h) of section 209 of such act is amended by striking out "section 208 (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 208 (e)."

Sec. 5. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 210 of such act is amended by changing the comma after the word "appointment" to a semicolon and striking out the rest of such paragraph.

Sec. 6. (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 211 of such act is amended to read "A commissioned officer shall be retired on the first day of the month following the month in which he attains the age of 64 years; and a commissioned officer shall be retired on the first day of a month if he has attained the age of 60 years, has completed 30 years of active service in the Service, and has filed application for retirement."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 211 of such act is amended by changing the words "for age" to "under the provisions of subsection (b)."

(c) Section 211 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Retired pay pursuant to subsection (a), subsection (b), or subsection (e) shall be terminated if the officer receiving such pay is recalled to active duty, or in the case of an officer of the Reserve Corps, if he is found to have recovered from his disability. Such pay shall be suspended for any period during which an officer falls without good cause to comply with a request by the Surgeon General that he submit to a medical examination, and shall be terminated if such failure continues for 6 months."

Sec. 7. Section 212 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(e) In the case of an officer who is or hereafter becomes entitled to full military benefits, the definition in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be interpreted as of the effective date of this subsection or as of the date when such officer ceased to be on active duty, whichever date is earlier. The exclusion from full military benefits in such paragraph of the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to any such officer if he is separated from the commissioned corps of the service or is relieved from active duty therein within 3 years after the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President."

Sec. 3. Title II of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TRAINING OF OFFICERS

"Sec. 218. (a) Appropriations available for the pay and allowances of commissioned officers of the Service shall also be available, subject to the limitations prescribed in such appropriations, for payment of tuition, fees, and other necessary expenses incident to attendance at any educational institution by any commissioned officer of the Regular Corps while on active duty.

"(b) Any officer whose tuition and fees while attending an educational institution are paid pursuant to subsection (a) shall be required to reimburse the Service for the expenditures so made if he voluntarily leaves the Service within 2 years after the cessation of such attendance."

Sec. 9. Title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART H—EDUCATIONAL GRANTS

"APPROPRIATION FOR GRANTS FOR OPERATION OF SCHOOLS

"Sec. 371. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year a sum suffi-

cient to enable the Surgeon General, through grants to postgraduate schools of public health, to assist in improving the training available in the field of public health and in increasing the number of individuals adequately trained in such field. Grants from funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used by the schools for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of teaching staffs and the maintenance and operation of facilities (including the acquisition of equipment), and for scholarships (including maintenance) for persons contemplating work in the field of public health.

"APPROPRIATION FOR GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION

"Sec. 372. There are also authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to enable the Surgeon General to make grants for the construction of buildings and other facilities necessary to carry out the purposes of section 371. In recommending estimates of appropriations under this section for any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall set forth the order and sequence of priority for individual building projects in accordance with their estimated importance or value in carrying out the purposes of section 371; but he shall set forth only such projects as are approved by the National Advisory Health Council. In the Budget the President shall set forth an estimate of expenditures and appropriations for such projects both in summary and by individual projects.

"METHOD OF MAKING GRANTS

"Sec. 373. For each fiscal year the Surgeon General shall determine the total sum from the appropriation under section 371 which shall be available for distribution among postgraduate schools of public health upon the basis of enrollment. The remainder of such appropriation shall be distributed equally among such schools. The Surgeon General, in accordance with regulations, shall determine from time to time the amount to which each school is entitled under this section, and shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts so determined. He shall also, from time to time, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts to which a school may be entitled from appropriations under section 372. Upon receipt of any such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay in accordance with such certification.

"CONDITIONS FOR GRANTS

"Sec. 374. Grants under this part shall be made upon such conditions as may be prescribed in regulations; and may be made only to such postgraduate schools of public health as are accredited by a body or bodies approved by the Surgeon General.

"USE OF GRANT MONEY

"Sec. 375. Any money paid to a school under this part shall be used solely in carrying out the purposes specified in section 371 or section 372, as the case may be, and any money so paid which is not so used shall be repaid to the United States and deposited in the Treasury."

Sec. 10. Section 402 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end of paragraph (g) thereof to a semicolon and adding the following new paragraph:

"(h) in accordance with regulations, make grants in aid to public and other nonprofit universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other institutions for the establishment and maintenance of facilities for training persons in matters relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of cancer and for the conduct of cancer research, including the construction and acquisition of buildings and equipment necessary for such facilities."

The letter presented by Mr. GEORGE, from the Federal Security Agency, in explanation of the bill, is as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, June 3, 1946.

HON. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President of the Senate *pro tempore*,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing for your consideration a legislative proposal to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration.

The Public Health Service Act (Public Law 410, 78th Cong., 42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) was enacted July 1, 1944, for the purpose of consolidating and revising the laws relating to the Public Health Service. The constructive effects of this legislation upon the administration of the greatly diversified programs of the Public Health Service have been almost incalculable. Yet, despite the extreme care and exhaustive study that went into the drafting of the act, it was impossible then to foresee clearly all of the problems, requiring amendment of that act for solution, which might and did arise. Most of these problems, though arising in connection with the Service's several efforts to regain and restore the losses suffered by civilian health programs as a result of the war, actually resolve themselves chiefly into the one basic problem of personnel.

The Government's policy throughout the war of sacrificing its long-range permanent interests in the Nation's scientific and technical potential for the sake of and in the name of more immediate war needs, however necessary it may have been, is beginning already to reflect itself in a technical labor market more highly competitive than at any time in the Nation's history. This is particularly true in the field of medicine, where throughout the war the Nation's entire educational machinery was geared to the mass production of physicians with the barest minimum of educational requirements and where the vast proportion of research facilities hitherto devoted to the country's fundamental health problems were diverted to the more restricted, but then more impelling, problems of war medicine. The net effect of this policy has been to create a medical generation which, unless aggressive corrective measures are taken, will fail the Nation in the discharge of those obligations which are essential to further health progress.

The Public Health Service will be short-sighted indeed if it fails to take into account the many implications of its expanding obligations in both national and international fields upon its own personnel policy; or if it postpones longer some definitive action looking toward the training of personnel needed in order to make any real progress on such problems as cancer, mental illness, and dental disease.

It is primarily for these broad purposes that this bill to amend the Public Health Service Act is proposed. Some of the amendments proposed in the bill seek to accomplish these purposes by directing their attack toward the inflexible and inadequate existing provisions relating to the appointment of commissioned officers of the Service. Other amendments proposed by the bill seek to accomplish these purposes by directing their attack toward the problem of training personnel.

The amended section 208 (b) seeks to aid the Service in obtaining sufficient qualified officers to carry on its activities by permitting greater flexibility in the number of original appointments authorized annually at a grade above that of the senior assistant grade.

The new section 218 and the new part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act deal with problems of training and education. The new section 218 would authorize

the Service to assign a small number of the commissioned officers in the regular corps to educational institutions where training necessary to keep them abreast of advances in medical science is more readily available. The new part H of title III would clarify the procedure under which postgraduate schools of public health receive financial aid from the Federal Government. In order to assure an adequate supply of personnel well trained in the field of public health, the Service would be authorized to make grants directly to postgraduate schools of public health—schools of which there are now only a few, on which the entire country must depend for its supply of formally trained public health personnel, and which will be unable without financial assistance to train adequately a sufficient number of such personnel.

In addition to the amendments designed to accomplish the broad purposes described above, the bill would effect a number of minor, though important, modifications and corrections in the Public Health Service Act.

Section 1 of the enclosed draft amends section 2 (j) of the Public Health Service Act, which defines the term "habit-forming narcotic drug," so as to include isonipecaine (trade name, "demerol"). This is purely a technical amendment, there being no longer any doubt that isonipecaine is a habit-forming drug which should come within the purview of section 302 of the Public Health Service Act. Similar amendments have already been made in the tariff laws and other laws dealing with narcotics (Public Law 414, 78th Cong.).

The very nature of the work of the Public Health Service, and especially the peculiar character of the cooperative administrative relationships it maintains with other Federal agencies, not infrequently create obligations of unusual difficulty and complexity which, though of temporary duration, require the detail and assignment of Service personnel of unusual competence. There will be repeated instances in the future, as there have been in the past, where the importance of such temporary projects will clearly justify for the incumbent the temporary grade of Assistant Surgeon General. Section 2 (b) of the enclosed draft amends section 207 (a) of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide the degree of flexibility considered essential in this regard by authorizing the Administrator rather than the President to establish temporary positions necessary for important temporary work and by not restricting this authority to time of war or emergency, as is done under existing law. It contains, however, sufficient safeguards, through continuing at three the existing limitation on the number of such special positions which may exist at any one time and through restricting the eligible appointees to commissioned officers in the full grade or above, to ensure that appointments made under this authority will be kept well within the limits of propriety. Other provisions of the existing section 207 (a), relating to the creation of other special temporary positions and assignment of commissioned officers to them, are omitted here because that matter will now be more conveniently covered under the other provisions of the section as amended by section 2 (c) of the enclosed draft.

The new section 207 (b), included in section 2 (c) of the draft, continues the existing entitlement of commissioned officers, assigned to serve as chiefs of divisions, to the grade of director while so assigned. It also continues the President's authority to prescribe grades for specified positions as well as the provision entitling officers to such grades while assigned to such positions. The President's authority, however, will be exercised through regulations and will no longer be restricted to positions of a temporary nature; nor will the exercise of

such authority be restricted to time of war or emergency.

Section 2 (c) of the draft also makes some changes in the present subsection (b) of section 207, which is to be redesignated as subsection (c), but these are purely technical changes necessitated by other changes in the section. Section 2 (a) of the draft merely changes the title of section 207 of the Public Health Service Act to make it a more accurate indication of the content of the section as amended by the enclosed draft.

Section 3 (a) of the draft amends section 208 (a) (2) of the Public Health Service Act. It is a technical amendment designed solely to clarify and simplify administrative procedure. The Public Health Service Act at present provides for termination of all Reserve Corps commissions in the discretion of the President. The amendment here proposed would authorize the President to direct that actual termination be made by an appropriate official of the Federal Security Agency or in such other manner as he may think appropriate.

Section 3 (b) of the draft amends section 208 (b) of the Public Health Service Act so as to enable the President during each fiscal year to make initial appointments to the Regular Corps of officers in grades above that of senior assistant (equivalent to captain in the Army) in numbers not to exceed ten percent of the total number of appointments authorized to be made for such year. Under present authority, which has existed since 1930, only three such appointments are permissible during any one year. In 1930 and for a considerable time thereafter the total new appointments made annually approximated only about 30 or 35 so that the 3 positions at higher grades then provided for bore substantially the same ratio to the total appointments as that now being sought through this amendment. With both the scope and volume of its work materially increasing the Public Health Service finds it quite impossible under existing limitations to recruit at the grade of senior assistant or below the number of new personnel needed who have already attained the necessary competence in the several specialized fields. The alternative in the past has been an increasing dilution of the more mature and experienced talent of the Service through spreading the limited numbers of such personnel over an increasing range of activities and then filling in with younger and less well trained people. The amendment proposed by section 3 (b) of the enclosed draft would help the Service to overcome the unfortunate results of this dilution of its more experienced and mature personnel. It contains, however, sufficient safeguards assuring appointment of qualified personnel by requiring appointees to meet standards established in accordance with regulations of the President.

Section 3 (c) of the enclosed draft amends section 208 of the Public Health Service Act by inserting a new subsection (c). This new subsection would authorize the Administrator to issue, under the seal of the Federal Security Agency, commissions evidencing the appointment of officers in the Regular or Reserve Corps by the President. This is similar to authority already given under existing law to other agencies of the Government to which commissioned officers may be appointed (see, e. g., the act of March 3, 1875, as amended, 5 U. S. C. 11). It is also authority which the Secretary of the Treasury exercised when the Public Health Service was in his department.

Section 3 (d) of the enclosed draft further amends section 208 of the Public Health Service Act by adding another new subsection (subsec. (h)) under which commissioned officers on continuous and uninterrupted active duty would not ordinarily

be required to renew their oaths of office upon change of grade. Renewal of the oath of office in such cases seems an unnecessary administrative burden. Existing law already exempts Army officers from such a requirement. This amendment makes unnecessary the provision in section 210 (a) (1) of the Public Health Service Act eliminating the requirement of renewal of oath of office in case of temporary wartime promotions. Section 5 of the enclosed draft amends that section of the act accordingly.

Section 4 is merely a technical drafting amendment necessitated by the redesignation, in section 3 (c) of the draft, of the various subsections in section 208 of the Public Health Service Act.

Section 6 (a) of the draft amends the first sentence of section 211 (b) of the Public Health Service Act. It would add to the existing compulsory retirement of commissioned officers of the Regular Corps at age 64 an optional retirement at the age of 60 years, provided they have completed 30 years of active service. This provision is in keeping with the general trend toward earlier retirement throughout both government and industry, although it is less liberal than existing provisions for the other commissioned services.

Section 6 (b) of the draft is merely a technical drafting amendment required by reason of the amendment proposed in section 6 (a).

Section 6 (c) of the draft further amends section 211 of the Public Health Service Act by the addition of a new subsection. This amendment is also of a technical nature designed merely to clarify existing authority in respect to retired pay of officers. At the present time the Service is somewhat doubtful as to the consequences of a Reserve officer's recovery from a disability for which he has been retired and for which he is receiving retired pay. The proposed new subsection would remove these doubts by providing for termination of the retired pay in case of recovery. It would also prescribe suspension of a retired officer's pay for refusal to submit without good cause to a medical examination, and for termination of the pay if the failure to submit to the medical examination continues for 6 months.

Section 7 of the enclosed draft further amends section 212 of the Public Health Service Act by the addition of a new subsection (subsec. (e)). Under the present section 212, commissioned officers of the Service are entitled, with respect to their service on detail to the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, their service outside of the continental United States in time of war, and active service while the Public Health Service is a part of the armed forces, to the same benefits as were provided on account of active commissioned Army service on July 1, 1944, the date of enactment of the Public Health Service Act. However, there were excluded from the benefits those which are provided for specifically elsewhere in the Public Health Service Act, as well as reemployment rights for Regular officers and Reserve officers called to active duty prior to November 11, 1943. Also excluded are the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944.

The amended section 212 would remove the differences between the Service and other branches of the armed forces in regard to military benefits by speaking as of the date of enactment of the enclosed draft for all officers of the Service who are on active duty on that date. For any officer not on active duty then, but who is entitled to full military benefits by reason of service while the Public Health Service is a part of the military forces or otherwise, the amended section would speak as of the date when his service ceased. The new subsection (e) would also eliminate the exclusion of mustering-out pay from the benefits available to officers entitled to full military benefits. This would

seem a logical complement of the extension of full military benefits to all benefits provided for Army service as of the time of enactment of the enclosed draft. Since the Service has been made a part of the military forces of the United States under Executive Order No. 9575 (June 21, 1945, effective July 29, 1945), it seems reasonable that all benefits appertaining to military status should be made available to officers of the Public Health Service as well as to the other commissioned services.

Section 8 of the draft would add a new section to title II of the Public Health Service Act. The new section 218 would authorize the Service to provide, subject to any limitations contained, the appropriations for the pay and allowances of commissioned officers, training for commissioned officers of the Regular Corps through payment of their tuition, fees, and other expenses while attending educational institutions. In public health, as in the sciences generally, progress is a function of an almost continuous process of learning. The Service in order to discharge its functions effectively must keep abreast of the several sciences upon which its work rests.

The field of these sciences, however, is much too large to be encompassed completely by any single organization. Discoveries, new knowledge, and new techniques originate from the widest variety of sources. Accordingly, it is essential that the Service be able to take advantage of such new knowledge by keeping its own officers adequately informed not alone through in-service training, but also through sending them to the institutions where such knowledge can most readily be imparted to them.

Section 9 of the draft, which adds a new part to title III of the Public Health Service Act, is essentially a technical amendment designed to give to the Service explicit authority which has in the past been assumed to exist under the provisions of section 314 of the Public Health Service Act. Under the existing provisions the Public Health Service has in the past given money to the States for use in public health work, and part of these funds has been used to assist accredited schools of public health in providing facilities for training public health personnel for use throughout the country. On these the entire country must depend for its formally trained public health personnel.

It has been the experience of these schools that to provide one academic year of training for a postgraduate student it costs the school approximately \$1,000 over and above any revenues it derives from the individual student. Some of these schools are State-owned. Others are supported through endowments. In neither case are the budgets available to them adequate to satisfy the large backlog of need for trained personnel that has accumulated during the war. Moreover, the State institutions quite properly point out the inequity of having a single State bear the extra expense of training personnel admitted from other States. Since almost 100 percent of the students of these schools go into public service, the desirability of giving them the much needed assistance is unquestionable. The new part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act attempts not only to provide a reasonable formula for making allotments in the program as here expanded, but also to include the safeguards that are considered desirable in relation to grants for construction for carrying out this program of training. It is anticipated that the construction grants will never be large. There will, however, be instances when a small amount of aid for renovation or expansion of physical facilities will provide returns in education all out of proportion to the amounts expended.

Section 10 of the enclosed draft, which amends section 402 of the Public Health Service Act by the addition of a new sub-

section, is designed to aid the Public Health Service to carry out one of the stated purposes of title IV of the act, viz, "to provide training and instruction in technical matters relating to the diagnosis and treatment of cancer" (section 402 (c) of Public Law 410). Some of the needed training in cancer work can be provided through fellowships pursuant to section 402 (d). If, however, the training program is to be developed in any reasonable relation to the enormity of the need for adequately trained personnel, training facilities must be vastly expanded. At the moment they are extremely limited. All too often the highly developed pedagogical facilities have access to only a limited amount of clinical material; and even more often only limited teaching facilities exist in institutions where clinical material is abundant. To bring the many and varied needed skills and equipment together and at the same time provide care for a sufficient number of patients to serve educational and training purposes is usually beyond the financial competence of any but the exceptional institution. The proposed amendment would help remedy this unfortunate situation.

I shall appreciate it if you will be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the proper committee for action.

The Bureau of the Budget raised some objections to this draft bill in its original form when submitted to that Bureau for advice as to its relationship to the program of the President. The enclosed draft bill has been revised in the light of those objections.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE COLLINS,
Acting Administrator.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 6407) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MOORE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT 1211 RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. McMAHON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 282), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there be printed 4,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 1211, cur-

rent session, accompanying the bill (S. 1717) for the development and control of atomic energy, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, 1,000 for the Senate document room, and 1,000 for the House document room.

PRINTING COMPILATION OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940 WITH AMENDMENTS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent compilation of the Nationality Act of 1940, with amendments through March 31, 1946, may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS, OF UTAH, AT MEETING OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a rally honoring visiting Soviet journalists under the auspices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, New York City, May 29, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH AT GALLAUDET COLLEGE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a commencement address delivered by him at the graduation exercises of Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C., June 1, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH BEFORE MIZARCHI ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Mizarchi Zionist Organization of America at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, June 2, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON THE DRAFT BILL

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on the subject of the draft bill, on June 8, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT MAKES A SENATOR—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What Makes a Senator?" by Richard L. Neuberger, published in the Wisconsin Progressive of the June 1946 issue, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE OPA AND ITS PROBLEMS

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the OPA and its problems delivered by Chester Bowles, broadcast on June 4 over the Columbia Broadcasting System, and also addresses by Senator TAFT, Senator HICKENLOOPER, and Senator WHERRY on the same subject broadcast on June 6, 1946, over the same network, which appear in the Appendix.]

OPA RESTAURANT REGULATIONS

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Bernard L. Willis of Lake City, Iowa, dealing with OPA regulations of restaurants and stores, together with application for price adjustment of Palmer's Coffee Shop, at Lake City, Iowa, and a newspaper item relating to OPA settlements, which appear in the Appendix.]

HOUSING AND ACCOMMODATION OF VETERANS AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him under date of June 5, 1946, by Virgil M. Hancher, together with answers to questionnaires by the National Association of State Universities, dealing with the subject of the housing and accommodations at educational institutions, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH BY EDGAR CAMPBELL BEFORE LANCASTER COUNTY INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Edgar Campbell, candidate for Congress, Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, before the Lancaster County Industrial Union Council, on May 23, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY GEORGE CUSHING

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Memorial Day address delivered at Brighton, Mich., on May 30, 1946, by George Cushing, news editor of Station WJR of Detroit, Mich., which appears in the Appendix.]

VINSON BACKS CONGRESS ON LAW—ARTICLE BY JOHN H. CLINE

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Vinson Backs Congress on Law," by John H. Cline, published in the Washington Star of June 9, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNJUST CRITICISM STRIKES AT CONFIDENCE IN CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY REPRESENTATIVE CLARENCE CANNON

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Unjust Criticism Strikes at Confidence in Congress," by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman, House Appropriations Committee, published in the Washington Star of June 9, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOR A MODERN CONGRESS—EDITORIAL IN THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "For a Modern Congress," published in the Washington Post of June 10, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGE; A NEW CHAPTER—ADDRESS BY DAVID E. LILLIENTHAL

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a commencement address entitled "The Land-Grant College: A New Chapter," delivered by David E. Lillienthal, Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, at Utah Agricultural College, Logan, Utah, June 8, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

KEEP ON KEEPING ON—POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle, entitled "Keep On Keeping On," which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolu-

tion, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 6343. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to lend certain property of the War Department to national veterans' organizations for use at State and national conventions; and

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution to correct a technical error in the act approved April 18, 1946 (Public Law 347, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session).

ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2177) to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. MCCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to state that it is my hope we can continue consideration of the pending bill today, and if necessary have a session into the evening.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to state that I join in the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin. I had thought we might undertake to consider the price-control bill sometime today, but I think the Senate ought to be given an opportunity to vote one way or another on the pending bill. I would not care to begin the consideration of the OPA legislation in the middle of the afternoon. Therefore, I think the Senate should devote the whole day, and if necessary go into the evening, in an effort to obtain a vote on the pending measure. I think the Senate is entitled to vote on the bill one way or another. If the Senate does not wish to adopt the bill it can vote against it, but, after all the work which has been done by the joint committee and the special committee, we ought to bring the matter to a conclusion. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, there will be no effort to bring up any other kind of legislation today.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, when the Senate recessed Saturday afternoon, I was discussing an amendment which I had offered to strike out subsection (a) of section 243 of the pending bill. That part of the measure to which I seriously object and to which the amendment is directed, provides that pages for the Senate and House of Representatives shall be appointed by the Director of Congressional Personnel from among boys who live at home with their parent or parents or guardian, or in orphanages in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. I might have moved merely to strike out the words "in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia," if my only purpose were to protect boys from the States who might want to become pages; but I moved to strike out the entire subsection, because it provides that all the pages shall be appointed by the Director of Congressional Personnel.

Mr. President, I do not favor the creation of an office of Personnel Director for the Congress of the United States. The

theory is that if we will establish a Personnel Director to select all our employees for us, Members of Congress will be relieved of some work. From my experience I do not believe that that would be true. It would probably increase our work, instead of relieving us of any burden we now have. If we enact this law and create the position of Director of Congressional Personnel, delegating to him all the power contemplated by the bill, that will not keep our constituents from coming to us and seeking positions in Washington, or asking us to assist them in finding employment. They will not go directly to the Director of Personnel, even if the office is created. They will go first to the office of their Senator or Representative. They will ask us for the positions, just as they have always done.

We are trying to say to them, "We no longer have authority over that subject. We have established a Director of Congressional Personnel, and you must file your application with him. He will determine whether you are qualified or not. If he likes you and thinks you are qualified, and you meet the standards which he has established, probably he will give you the job."

That will not satisfy our constituents. That will not satisfy the boy who wants a position in Washington. The next thing he will say will be, "I want you to help me with the Director of Personnel. I want your endorsement. I want you to help me get this job." Today certain positions are allocated to Members of Congress. We know what they are. If application is made to us for one of them and the position is filled we can say so. If it is not filled, we can consider whether to recommend the applicant or give him the position. It is proposed to tie our hands so far as concerns our authority and our willingness to take the responsibility for doing a simple thing, namely, helping some boy or some man who wants an opportunity to work in Washington. It is sought to shift that responsibility. Instead of relieving ourselves of work we shall be stripping ourselves of authority. The appeal will still be made to us. It is proposed to establish another agency or bureau with a director to whom we must go and beg for the very thing we can do now; and he will be able to say, "No."

I do not think the time has come when as a Member of the Senate I ought to have to ask a personnel director whether I can put a boy in the position of elevator operator. I do not believe that the efficiency of our pages has broken down to such an extent that we must have one man to tell us whether a page boy is doing his duty, or whether he ought to be replaced, or whether some applicant ought to be favored with the appointment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is speaking of the pages. If this bill should become a law, could the Senator from Arkansas or any other Senator appoint a page boy in the Senate from his State?

Mr. McCLELLAN. So far as I know, at present there are no pages from my

State; but if I should receive an application—and I anticipate that I shall, because some fathers and mothers have already talked with me about their boys, who would like to have the opportunity to come to Washington as pages—I would not want to deny the boys of my State that opportunity. I do not want to shirk the responsibility of helping a boy to obtain such a position. I will not vote for a bill to establish a personnel director to tell me that a worthy boy from my State cannot have the position if it is available. Other Senators may shift that responsibility if they so desire. They may set up a dictator if they wish to do so. We have enough of that already. In the departments in Washington the chiefs have the authority to employ their own personnel. If an applicant from my State or from the Senator's State desires a position in one of the departments, and we try to help him obtain it, we must write letters or go to the department and plead with some department official, and worry about it.

This provision would take away from us the one thing that is left to us. It would even apply to pages in the United States Senate. Mr. President, if a Senator is not competent to judge the qualifications of a page in the United States Senate, I question his ability to judge and weigh and vote intelligently upon the legislation and the problems facing this country.

It is said that the proposed system would relieve us of work. It would not relieve us of anything except the opportunity to take care of boys from our own States who may be deserving. Someone may say, "Surely the Personnel Director will take that into account." If this section remains in the bill he cannot take it into account unless the boy lives in Washington. I do not know why we must say that page boys must come from the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. It does not make sense to me. I do not know from what States these boys come; but according to the information which I have obtained from the Secretary of the Senate, only 5 of the 21 are legal residents of the District of Columbia. With respect to the other 16, the parents of some now live in Washington. The parents of others do not. If this bill is enacted, the 8 or 10 boys who are now serving as pages, and whose parents do not live in Washington, or who do not have a legal guardian living in the District of Columbia, will no longer be eligible to serve. I do not think it is fair or just to the page boys. There is no justification for such a provision in the selection of page boys in the future.

This section of the bill is only one of many to which I have serious objection. In the first place, as I have indicated, I am opposed to the general idea and theory of a personnel director to handle all the employees who serve us in the Capitol.

I wish to ask a question. I have been here for 3½ years. So far as I know and so far as I have been able to ascertain, there is no inefficiency, comparatively speaking, on the part of any of the employees of the Senate. However, according to the theory of the pending measure, there is a desire to do away

with the Disbursing Office, and to turn it over to the Director of Personnel.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I have been in the Senate for approximately 13 years, and I regard Mr. Oco Thompson as one of the most valuable and one of the most efficient officials with whom I have ever been in contact.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. That has been my estimation and my appraisal of him, too, from my brief acquaintance with him and from the contacts I have had with him.

The point I am making is simply this: I am not saying that the Congress does not need some overhauling and some reorganization; but when we reorganize it, we should do so with a view to eliminating that which now is inefficient and which now is not functioning properly, and we should try to enact legislation which will make such changes as will improve the situation.

But we have before us a bill which provides a catch-all proposition of placing all Senate employees under the control or direction of a man to be selected by the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives. If one of them makes the selection, that will be all right. But I cannot understand why it is proposed that we burden ourselves with legislation of this character in an effort to undertake to make a change in all of the agencies and all of the departments here which are doing their work efficiently now. I dare say there has been no complaint. Without complaint, in my judgment there can be no justification for the proposed change.

Suppose we pass the bill. My own opinion is that there will be just as much occasion, and probably more, at least on the part of Senators, for complaint after the bill is enacted as there has been in the past. We hear a great deal of condemnation about the so-called patronage system. I have never cared anything about patronage, and I think any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives who undertakes to depend upon patronage for his political security is simply foolish and is making a mistake. I do not think it is of that much benefit or that much value to Members of Congress. I do not wish to retain the right to select pages because of any political advantage which that right of patronage might give. Actually, I do not know that it would give any advantage at all. If a Senator appoints a page, perhaps the page's father and mother may vote for the Senator, if that is what some persons are thinking of, but I do not know that it would extend much further than that.

I do not see why I should deprive myself of the right to participate in the appointment of pages. If some boy from my State wishes to become a page in the Senate—perhaps an orphan boy or perhaps a boy of humble parentage who has no opportunity to go to school, at least to a school of the quality of the school which he would attend as a page of the Senate—I wish to have the right

to help him if I can, not for the purpose of obtaining votes myself, not for any political gain, although that is one of the points which is mentioned in referring to patronage, but I wish to help that boy by giving him an opportunity to obtain a good education, and I wish to see that the boys of my State have a right in that respect equal to that of boys who live in the District of Columbia. I see no reason for placing residents of the District of Columbia in a preferred status. A boy living in the District of Columbia can serve as a page, as the situation is today; but under the terms of the pending bill a boy living in Wisconsin or Iowa or any other State of the Union would be ineligible to serve as a page, unless his parents moved to the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, sometimes we wonder why men with great ability, men who are capable of earning in private life five times as much salary as they are paid as Senators of the United States or Members of the House of Representatives, will dedicate their lives to the service of their country and of their State here in the Senate or in the House of Representatives for the small salary which they are paid—comparatively small, I say, in proportion to the salary which their abilities would entitle them to earn in positions in private life. Mr. President, what is one of the finest compensations of serving in the Senate of the United States or in the House of Representatives? It is not the little check of about \$700 which a Member of the Congress receives each month. That is not what keeps him here. It is the opportunity to serve those who need help. One of the finest compensations of service in the Congress, one which I value and cherish most, is the opportunity which service in the Congress affords the Members of Congress to help someone who is struggling to get an education or to meet some of the other problems of life. That is one of the finest compensations of service in the Congress. If that privilege is denied to those who serve here, the opportunity which Members of the Congress now have to be of service to their constituents will, to a great extent, be gone.

Mr. President, I know that a great deal of the time of Members of Congress is consumed, today, by running errands for their constituents. Entirely too much time is consumed in that way. I know that, and I know the pressure and the burden which it places upon us. Some Members of Congress have greater problems in that respect, possibly, than I do; but I know that in view of the great expansion of Government and all its ramifications which reach out into every community and every home in the Nation, our work with respect to looking after the private problems of our constituency has increased to the point that, today, it consumes a major portion of the time of every Member of Congress. That cannot be helped. To whom else can our constituents go? We may reorganize the Congress all we wish, but we shall still have that problem, unless we simply take a position of refusing to come to the assistance of our constitu-

ents or a position of refusing to offer our efforts in their behalf when they appeal to us with their problems. I make no criticism of my constituents for appealing to me about the problems they have with various agencies of the Government. To whom else can they appeal? They can write a letter to some bureau or agency in Washington, but the average humble citizen cannot come to Washington and plead his case. Often he needs an advocate at the bar of authority in order to get his claim or his problem properly presented and even in order to get fair and just consideration and to obtain the action necessary to protect his interests. Ofttimes, even in spite of all the efforts we make, we fail in the attempt to help him in that way. The Congress has established various agencies and departments, and probably rightfully so, and the Congress has given them the responsibility and authority which they exercise. Often when Members of Congress present particular problems to them, they say "No"; and yet they have been created with that power by the elected representatives of the people of this country. We have created them in that way. So our constituents appeal to us to help them with the problems which they have with the various agencies or bureaus. I assume there is no other way to proceed, in many cases. Perhaps the Congress does need reorganization in some respects, but that does not mean that the proposed system with reference to the Congress and with reference to the employees who serve us should be adopted. I am not going to place myself in the ridiculous position of saying that I can no longer be the judge of the worthiness of a boy from my State who has the ambition and the desire and probably the necessity, because of his circumstances in life, in connection with his hope to obtain an education, to become a page in the Senate. I am not going to place myself in the position of having to say to him that he cannot serve as a page here unless he can persuade his parents to move to Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, it may sound as though this is a matter of too little importance upon which to spend much time. I do not wish to consume too much time of the Senate, but this bill does not involve only a small matter. I have pointed out one instance in which I believe we have gone far afield in the purpose to reorganize the Congress in order that it may become more efficient in its operation. If, as a Senator, I thought that the conduct of the page boys who have been selected by other Senators had broken down to such an extent that we are no longer capable of judging the qualifications and merits of those boys, and that we needed an expert at a salary of \$10,000 a year to promote the efficiency of Congress, I would vote for this section of the bill. However, I do not believe that any Senator, by any force of argument, eloquence, or logic, can establish the fact that the proposed arrangement will improve the efficiency or service of a single page.

I have been pleased, as I have already said, to talk with the parents of two or

three boys who desired to come to Washington some day in order to be a page. The parents of those boys wanted them to have an opportunity to obtain firsthand observation and experience with reference to the functions of the Government, and at the same time be enabled to earn a small amount of compensation in order to sustain them while attending school at night and during recesses of the Congress. Mr. President, the boys who wish to come here and those who have come here are boys of the finest character. They are boys with ambition, and they are looking forward to the future. They have high hopes. I do not wish to dash away such hopes in a boy in my State by being required to say to him, in effect, "I do not want to take any steps in helping you. I have attempted to absolve myself from any responsibility with reference to you, and have provided for a personnel director to size you up and determine whether or not you should have the opportunity which you seek." Mr. President, I am not ready, and I am not willing to do that.

As I have already said, referring particularly to title II of the bill, I am opposed to the general philosophy of that title. I believe that what I have said with reference to the page boys holds substantially true with reference to the employees of all the other departments in the Congress. I see no justification whatever for the revolutionary changes which have been proposed. I predict, Mr. President, that if we pass this bill we will take a course which will not only prove embarrassing to us at times in the future, but it will increase and not relieve our present burdens. It will not help me to be a more efficient Senator, or to give more time to my senatorial duties. If the bill is enacted into law I will probably have less time to devote to my duties because I will be eternally after the Personnel Director to place this boy or that boy in some particular position. We know what the situation is at the present time. A fair allocation is made of the various positions in the Congress. When a boy is placed as an operator of an elevator, for example, he knows that he must be sufficiently proficient to operate that elevator and perform what other duties he may have in connection therewith. I dare say that we have no more difficulty now in that respect than we would have under a civil service personnel director, or whatever title we may decide to give to him.

Mr. President, while I am discussing this section of the bill, which ties into other sections of title II, I wish to refer also to some of the other provisions of the bill. I referred briefly to them last Saturday afternoon.

Over the week end I reread the bill and I read substantially the entire report of the committee which reported the bill to the Senate. As I studied the bill I came to the conclusion that, instead of the present title, namely, "A bill to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government," the appropriate title would be, "A bill to increase the cost of the legislative branch of the Government."

I read that part of the report in which an estimate is set forth of the cost of putting the bill into effect. It has been estimated by the committee that the cost will be between \$12,000,000 and \$13,000,000 a year. That is, of course, an estimate. It may be an accurate estimate, but I am inclined to the view that, instead of the cost being \$12,281,235 per annum, according to the committee report, before we have completed the creation of the jobs which it is proposed to create, the cost will probably be approximately \$25,000,000 a year. I am willing to agree that if, by spending that much money we could actually produce greater efficiency and afford more time to the Members of Congress to attend to legislative matters, it would probably be well to make the additional expenditure. But, in my judgment, the greatest contribution which could be made toward reorganizing the Congress so as to produce more efficiency in connection with its legislative functioning, would be to reorganize the present committees so that the Senate and the House would have corresponding committees with like jurisdiction in connection with all legislation. That is my idea of reorganizing the Congress of the United States.

I am not undertaking to say that we should have 16 committees or 25 committees in the Senate. I wish to say for the joint committee which studied the matter, that I believe they made a conscientious effort to make some progress in the right direction. I am not critical of what they have done.

I do not say that it could not have been done somewhat better; I do not know as to that; I do not say I could have done it any better; but this to me is the crux of reorganizing Congress: Set up standing committees corresponding in jurisdiction both in the House and the Senate, and then require those committees to meet in joint session for the consideration of legislation. That would expedite the work of the Congress; it would eliminate waste of time on our part and waste of time on the part of the administrative chiefs and employees who are required to come here to testify before committees.

This morning, Mr. President, I left the Committee on Commerce of the Senate at 11 o'clock when the Senate convened. In that committee today we began hearings on the bill (H. R. 6407) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes. That bill has already passed the House. The House Committee on Flood Control held extensive hearings on the bill. I do not recall just how much time was consumed in the House hearings, but several days, at any rate. This will illustrate what I have in mind and what I have been talking about. Today we are having hearings on the same bill in the Senate Committee on Commerce. The first witness called to testify at the hearings today is the Chief of Army Engineers. He and a part of his staff are there testifying today. What they are actually doing is covering substantially the same ground which was covered possibly less than a month ago, by the Flood Con-

trol Committee of the House of Representatives on the identical measure.

So, Mr. President, much time and duplication of effort would be saved if we would reorganize committees so as to set up substantially the same number of committees of corresponding jurisdiction in the two branches of Congress, and then require joint hearings on legislation of this character. The Senate committee could make its report to the Senate and the House committee make its report to the House; they would not have to make a joint report, but the same report; and the time that would be consumed in the consideration of a given piece of legislation in committee would simply be cut in half, and the time lost, the time consumed by departmental chiefs who have to testify on the bill in the House committee and then come over to the Senate and testify here would be conserved. They would have to spend only 1 day away from their offices and duties, whereas now they are required to spend at least 2 days, and possibly more.

Mr. President, that is what I have had in mind; that is what I was looking forward to when we would consider the reorganization of Congress. There are other things that can be done and should be done, but to me that is basic, it is fundamental. If we are going to make Congress more efficient, if we are going to conserve our time, if we are going to get better coordination and cooperation between the two bodies, if we are going to do these things, Mr. President, then that, in my judgment, is the way to go about it. Further progress might be made from such an approach, but that, in my judgment, is a proper approach to it. While this bill does provide that the committees may hold joint sessions, and it is probably contemplated that some of them will hold such sessions, I know that unless they are directed to do so, it is most unlikely that such joint meetings will occur.

Mr. President, this bill also seeks to meet a lot of our problems by staffing the committees with special experts. I say with respect to that approach to our problem that, no doubt, committees should have some professional assistance, some expert assistance, and I am not opposed to that approach to the reorganization problem; in fact, I favor it; but I cannot conceive of the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate needing or requiring 44 experts, which, as I understand, is what the pending bill provides for.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Johnson amendment provides that the subcommittee shall be authorized to appoint not more than four. So that now it is entirely in the hands of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct, and I think to that extent the modification is helpful, but I am talking about the general approach to this problem.

Moreover, I cannot conceive that many of the other committees will need four experts at \$8,000 a year to help them with their legislative work. The present committees in the past have gotten

along without any experts. They have had a clerk and possibly some other clerical help. I do not say that the help afforded them has been adequate, but I do say, Mr. President, that we are going pretty far when we are granting authority for the Appropriations Committee to hire 44 experts. I know, and we all know, that when we hire experts the experts have to employ secretaries and staffs. I am not attempting to be facetious, but if this reorganization bill is carried out and the increased number of employees contemplated under the measure are hired, together with the other employees necessary to serve them this Capitol will have to be enlarged, or at least office space in the form of a new building will have to be provided very near the grounds to meet the new situation.

While I have not served on the Appropriations Committee, I am of the opinion that four or five experts would be adequate for the full committee, and certainly the subcommittees, in my judgment, would not require more than one expert. There will be so many experts connected with the Appropriations Committee that it will take a room as large as this Chamber or larger to accommodate all of them for a committee session. Take 13 members of the committee, 44 professional experts, and their clerical help and employees, and we would just about have to move out of this Chamber and turn it over to them so that they could have room to function.

I understand, of course, that the Committee on Appropriations does not have to employ 44 experts, but I do know that when the authority is granted the inclination to exercise it becomes stronger and stronger. I believe we could very well restrain ourselves a bit with respect to that number. I believe the number for the other committees for the present, at least, should be reduced to one, or not over two at the outside.

But, Mr. President, we do not stop there; but we go further. We are going so far in employing experts that we are experting the Congress to death. We go on to provide for the legislative reference service. That is all right. We should have that service, but we increase it to the point of providing experts all along the line. Then that not being enough, we provide in paragraph 2 on page 44, that—

(2) The Librarian of Congress is further authorized—

We keep going on and on and on—to appoint in the Legislative Reference Service—

Listen to this: Not only have we those who now are in the Legislative Reference Service to look up statistics for us and give us information, but we go further in connection with the Legislative Reference Service:

The Librarian of Congress is to appoint senior specialists in the following broad fields—

Let me say that every senior specialist is going to require a staff about him.

They do not do the "leg" work, so to speak. They place themselves in a supervisory capacity, and each of them

will need an assistant or two. They will have to be staffed with clerks and secretaries. That is why I am saying, Mr. President, that the estimated cost of this change as contained in the bill in my judgment is not in agreement with what the cost will ultimately be. We know that once we start these things, Congress will be most reluctant ever to repeal the law. The more employees a Government officer has, the more he wants.

The Library of Congress is to appoint senior specialists in the following broad fields. First, in Agriculture. We have a Department of Agriculture, with all the specialists needed in it, and I do not know just what a senior specialist would do over in the Library of Congress as an agricultural expert. Perhaps there is some job he could fill after we got him staffed, but in my opinion it would mean a duplication of service that is already being performed.

Then the Librarian is to appoint one on the "American Government and public administration." That is broad enough to cover anything. He is to appoint another one on "American public law." I just wonder where we differentiate between the two. It strikes me that a specialist on American government and public administration would also be a specialist on American public law. If he was not, I do not know that he could be very much of a specialist or authority on government and public administration. Where would we differentiate between them? If there is no differentiation between them, if their duties are relatively the same, why have both of them?

There is to be another on "conservation." I do not know what it is thought that will cover. I do not know whether that refers to soil conservation, or conservation of the strength and energies of Senators, just what function a conservation expert would serve, I am unable to understand.

There is to be one on "education." We have a Department of Education, full of experts, I assume. I imagine that if we get the appropriation for this we will find that if sufficient funds are provided the Librarian can hire and pay for many experts.

There is to be another on "engineering and public works." We have agencies for that work.

Mr. President, I may be wrong about it, but I cannot help feeling and believing that instead of a reorganization of Congress, and getting down to the very basis of a problem which really is burdensome to us today, we are simply asked to go far afield, to create more bureaus and more agencies, and establishing more experts, and when we get through with it, we will meet ourselves coming back.

There is to be one on "full employment." We passed what was called a full employment bill, and set up a number of experts to study full employment, and to make recommendations to the President and to the Congress. Now we are asked to do it again, to create another agency in the Library of Congress on full employment.

There is to be another on "housing." We have a housing agency, with experts

in it. We are asked to set up another agency of that character in the Library of Congress.

There is to be one on "industrial organization and corporation financing." I do not know what duty that expert will perform. We have the RFC and all sorts of lending agencies, and their staffs. I do not know just what service this expert could perform.

Then there is to be another on "international affairs." We have a State Department, which should be pretty efficient. We have a splendid Foreign Affairs Committee and Foreign Relations Committee in the House and the Senate. Perhaps they need some assistance. We are going to staff them with four professional experts to begin with. Then we are asked to create this position, senior specialist in the Library of Congress, and of course he is going to have a staff to help him to do his work.

We are to have one on international trade. We have the Department of Commerce and various other agencies of the Government attending to that subject.

What we are doing in this bill, Mr. President, I am afraid—and I am not saying this to be critical of the committee—is not reorganizing Congress. We are merely expanding the Government, increasing the cost of Government, duplicating existing work and positions and authority, which will result in increased confusion instead of simplification of the work we have to do.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator apply that test to title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, found on page 56 of the reprint? Does the Senator think there is any expansion of Government contained in that section?

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is the section, and on what page is it found?

Mr. McMAHON. Page 56, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In the copy of the bill I have, page 56 has on it section 306, not section 301. Section 301 is the first section of title III.

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator asks me whether we are setting up there another agency of Government?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator complained that the bill expanded Government and really did not provide for reorganization. I wanted to know whether the Senator was excepting from his description of the bill, title III, the Regulation of the Lobbying Act. In other words, has the Senator any objection to that section?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator means do I have objection to the regulation of lobbying?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; I have not. If the bill does what I think it does, however, I want to say with respect to it that I do not know how we are to regulate what we call lobbying except by requiring professional lobbyists to register.

Who is a professional lobbyist? I have had in mind to ask the author of the bill

some questions about this title. As the bill is drawn now, and as I read the report, I understand it might apply to an organization such as there is in my State known as the economic council, which is devoting its whole purpose to seeking the enactment of legislation to bring about reforms in government, State and Federal, looking toward economy in government. So far as I know, the organization has no other purpose. It is just an organization of volunteers of citizens from all over the State, from all classes of people who are interested in trying to effectuate economy in government.

As I understand, under the bill as it is now written the secretary of that organization could not write me a letter with respect to any pending legislation until and unless he had registered here, and set out the organization he represented, what salary he was paid, who contributed to it, in other words, be placed in the position of a lobbyist. As I read the report on the bill, that is what the bill provides.

Mr. President, I would say to the Senate that I am wondering whether the provisions of the lobbying title of the bill are intended to include such organizations as the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Manufacturers Association, the CIO and the PAC, and the A. F. of L. Just whom do we include in it? Who and what organizations do the provisions of title 3 apply? Frankly, I should like some interpretation of it.

I should like to say, before going further, that I have not been bothered by lobbyists. So far as the Senator from Arkansas is individually concerned he has no complaint to make respecting lobbyists. I think that the professional lobbyists work where they find the field most fertile, and they have not been any problem to me, because I vote my own sentiments, and I am not very much influenced by professional lobbyists. They do not waste their time on me. I want that known. I have no complaint to make about that matter. But I do think it is well to require them to register. If we can do it by this provision in the bill or by some other means we should require that professional lobbyists who operate in Washington continuously be required to register so we will know who they are, so that Members of Congress when sitting in committees will know the lobbyists when they appear before the committees. It is perfectly all right that such lobbyists should register. I do not regard that as expanding any agency of government. I do not think we would set up a new agency for that purpose. The lobbyists would simply file reports and register with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator spoke of the CIO, the PAC, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and other organizations. I want the RECORD to show that personally I should like to have them all come under the provisions

of the bill, together with 500 or more others that ought to come under it also.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I have said, Mr. President, I have no objection to that. I simply want a clarification of the provision. There is one provision which says that it would not apply to those who would come under the Corrupt Practices Act. The PAC may regard itself as a political committee and therefore it would not be required under the provisions of this bill as now drawn to register.

I should like to know another thing about the provision. Does it mean that each one of the representatives of such agencies must register? Does it mean that the personal representatives of such organization must register before they are at liberty to come here to Washington and buttonhole Representatives and Senators and take up their time in their offices with respect to the enactment of any legislation or the defeat of any pending bill? I do not know. I should like to understand the provision better. I am not opposed to the provision, in fact, I favor its general purpose at least to require professional lobbyists to register and to make themselves known, and the interests they represent, and the pay they receive for their services. I am perfectly willing to see that done.

But, Mr. President, I do not want the provision to be so broad as to require that every constituent I have who happens to be identified with some organization must register before he can come up here and confer with me about legislation in which he is interested. For instance, a representative from the Farm Bureau Federation, or the Farmers' Union, or the Grange, may come up to confer with me. I meant to include those three organizations in the remarks I made a few minutes ago. I wonder if the lobbying provision applies to them, and if they would have to register. Would each individual representing the Grange or representing the other farm organizations be compelled to register before he could come to Washington and confer with me?

Mr. President, I should like to know also, after the national representatives of such organizations have registered, whether the State representatives would also have to register. I believe the head of the Farm Bureau is Mr. O'Neal, and Mr. Goss is head of the Grange, and Mr. Patten is head of the Farmers' Union. After they or their assistants have registered, I wonder if it would be necessary for the State president of any one of these organizations to register before he would be at liberty to come to Washington and confer with his Senators or his Representatives respecting legislation in which he is interested? The head of the Farm Bureau Federation in my State, the head of the Farmers' Union in my State, both have come to my office more than once to confer with me about pending legislation. They represent organizations interested in the enactment or the defeat of legislation. They come to see their Senators and their Representatives and talk to them about specific bills which they want defeated or which they want enacted or which they desire to have

amended. I wonder if the lobbying title of the bill is broad enough to take in such individuals and require that they place themselves on record as being lobbyists before they can talk to their Senators or their Representatives in respect to legislation in which they are interested.

Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to requiring the registration of professional lobbyists who stay in Washington, who are paid for that purpose, who are here to look after the interests of the organizations they represent and to lobby with Congress or to try to influence Representatives and Senators in the decisions they have to make as to their vote for or against legislation. I have no objection whatever to requiring them to register. It probably would be of some service to the Congress, perhaps it would be of some benefit to the Nation as a whole that the names of such individuals may be made known, that their programs may be known, and that their efforts to wield influence may be known. In other words, the Members of Congress would then have the opportunity to know who such individuals were, whom they represent, and what motivates them in their efforts to influence us with respect to legislation.

But, Mr. President, if I correctly recall, there is in the report upon the bill comment respecting this title which deals with the writing of letters by organizations. I believe that action would be precluded under this bill. I think it is going pretty far to say that unless they are registered, individuals cannot have an organization for a purpose dealing with affairs of government and write letters and send factual information to their Senators and Representatives respecting legislation in which they are interested. I call the Senate's attention to page 27 of the report of the committee. There I find a statement by the committee as to those to whom this lobbying title will apply. After mentioning a number to whom it does not apply, the report states:

On the other hand the title applies chiefly to three distinct classes of so-called lobbyists:

First, those who do not visit the Capitol but initiate propaganda from all over the country in the form of letters and telegrams, many of which have been based entirely upon misinformation as to facts. This class of persons and organizations will be required until the title, not to cease or curtail their activities in any respect, but merely to disclose the sources of their collections and the methods in which they are disbursed.

The provision may have a wholesome purpose. I do not know whether it can be restricted to that one purpose. One of the purposes is to try to reach those who spend large sums of money for broadcasting, buying radio time, or sending out literature which usually winds up with the request, "Be sure to write your Congressman or Senator to oppose H. R. —," or to support a certain Senate bill. There is a great deal of such activity. I doubt if there is any Senator who cannot sense the propaganda and pressure type of mail, even before he opens the envelope. It is not difficult. I know the people of my State well enough

so that when I receive a letter I can usually tell from the opening sentences whether the letter was inspired by the head of some organization, or by some of the propaganda which is continually being sent out over the channels of the air by commentators and others who spend a great deal of their time criticizing the Congress and trying to bring it into disrepute. They are agitators who think they are smart enough to tell the American people how they should vote in elections, and how Members of Congress should vote. They go even further than that. They are smart enough to tell the President what he ought to do and what he ought not to do.

So I am not very much interested in that class of propaganda. It has no influence on me, and I am not greatly disturbed by it. However, I believe there should be some regulation of the professional propagandists who are always trying to agitate the people and stir them up to write their Senators and Representatives on many subjects. These professional propagandists are motivated purely from a selfish or personal standpoint, or because they are paid for their activity. Does anyone believe that they go on the air in the interest of their country? When they call upon the people to write to their Senators and Representatives, telling them that a certain bill is a vicious measure, they are like criminal lawyers. They are hired, and are serving because they are paid for it. The sooner the people of America realize that, the less influence they will have with their efforts to smear.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does this provision apply to the man who represents a regular organization, such as a farmers' union, an REA cooperative, or something of the kind, but who extends his activities and lobbies in connection with bills which are of no direct interest to his organization? He pretends to say that his organization is for them. Would this bill reach such activity?

Mr. McCLELLAN. In its broader aspects I would say that it would. If the bill does what the report states, it certainly would reach that class of lobbyists.

Mr. CONNALLY. One of the most reprehensible practices is for a man who represents a farm organization, for example, to lobby in connection with something that has nothing to do with farm problems. He pretends that his organization is greatly interested in some legislation with respect to which his organization probably knows nothing. He is simply doing it on his own account, for reasons which I do not care to go into.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the Senator's contribution. As I stated when I was interrogated about this title of the bill, in my own mind it needs more clarification. I am not sure just what it does. I was reading from the report of the committee. I read a statement with reference to one class which initiates propaganda from all over the country, in the form of letters and telegrams. I receive a great many of such letters and tele-

grams, which are inspired by some outside organization, or by some radio commentator who is trying to tell the Congress how to run the country. He is so smart that he knows all about it, and he ridicules Congress for everything it does and fails to do. If this provision would reach him, it would be all right with me.

But I do not wish to see enacted any so-called antilobbying legislation which would preclude any citizen of my State from getting in touch with me about any legislation, so long as he is confining his efforts to his own representatives in Congress and conferring with them about legislation in which he or the organization which he represents may be interested. I say that he is exercising a constitutional right as a citizen, a right which I do not wish to deny him. I commend the committee for making an effort to reach the evils referred to by incorporating such a provision in the bill.

I believe that the bill, with all its comprehensive objectives and purposes, ought to be broken down into five or six separate bills. The lobbying problem is something with which Congress might well deal. I hope that ultimately a bill can be enacted which will provide some regulation of professional lobbyists. As I stated a while ago, they have not given me any trouble. I am not bothered by them. I am able to sense pretty well the character of the mail which comes to me, and what has inspired it. I am able to separate the wheat from the chaff, throw the chaff into the wastebasket, and give consideration to the letters of my constituents who are actuated by motives of good citizenship, patriotism, and public spirit, and who are sufficiently interested in the affairs of their country to write to me and express their opinions. I always welcome such letters. I give them all the consideration that my time and the pressure of duties will permit.

I do not always agree with my constituents. Often I receive letters from good, conscientious citizens who differ among themselves. Frequently in replying to such letters I tell my constituents that unfortunately I cannot agree with all of them, because they do not always agree among themselves on important issues.

Mr. President, the committee report points out two other classes of lobbyists who are brought within the purview of the bill. I have already referred to the first class. The report continues:

Second. The second class of lobbyists are those who are employed to come to the Capitol under the false impression that they exert some powerful influence over Members of Congress.

That is one of the things to which I was referring a moment ago. For example, the State president of the CIO in my State was in my office some 2 or 3 months ago, conferring with me about legislation in which he was very much interested and in which his organization was very much interested. I have no doubt that the organization paid his expenses to Washington for the purpose of having him confer with the Arkansas delegation in Congress. I wonder whether under the provisions of the

pending measure, in its broad terms, it is intended to require him to register here as a public or professional lobbyist, before he will be privileged to come to Washington and confer with his Senator or his Congressman in regard to pending legislation in which he is interested or in which his organization is interested. I think to impose such a requirement would be going entirely too far. It seems to me that any constituent of mine or any constituent of any other Member of Congress should have the privilege of conferring with his Congressman or his Senator on matters of public importance and interest, without being placed in the category of being a professional lobbyist. I think a distinction should be drawn. So far as I am concerned, as I said earlier in my statement, professional lobbyists do not bother me much; I do not let them take up a great deal of my time.

I read further from the report:

These individuals spend their time in Washington presumably exerting some mysterious influence with respect to the legislation in which their employers are interested, but carefully conceal from Members of Congress whom they happen to contact the purpose of their presence.

I cannot quite understand that reason for including them. I do not understand how they could lobby very well if they concealed the purpose of their conversation or the purpose of their presence. However that may be, if that provision applies to professional lobbyists and if it will help to expose them to the public and to bring them out into the open and to require them to make a record here of their activities, their collections, and their expenditures, so that it may be a public document and may be known to the country, then I certainly have no objection to such a requirement, and I shall gladly support legislation of that character.

I read further from the report:

The title in no wise prohibits or curtails their activities. It merely requires that they shall register and disclose the sources and purposes of their employment and the amount of their compensation.

Just as I said a while ago, Mr. President, I should not be willing to pursue that purpose so far as to prevent the president of the Federal Farm Bureau or the president of the CIO or the president of the A. F. of L. or the president of the Farmers Union, or the secretary of the chamber of commerce, or others who fill positions similar to that in my State, from coming to Washington and conferring with their congressional delegation unless they agreed to register and to report as professional lobbyists. I do not think the legislation should go that far. I think there is no need to have it go that far. I think it is probably an abridgement of the civil rights of our citizens and our constituents, when and if the law does go that far.

The report further says:

Third. There is a third class of entirely honest and respectable representatives of business, professional, and philanthropic organizations who come to Washington openly and frankly to express their views for or against legislation, many of whom serve a

useful and perfectly legitimate purpose in expressing the views and interpretations of their employers with respect to legislation which concerns them. They will likewise be required to register and state their compensation and the sources of their employment.

Mr. President, personally I have no objection to requiring them to register, but I think an exception should be written into this measure, or into this title of it, so as to keep it from applying to a citizen who comes within that class, when he contacts the representation of his own State in the Congress. I do not think we have a right to say to any citizen of our State that, as a citizen of the State, he cannot, without becoming a criminal because of violation of this proposed law, contact his Senator or his Representative in Congress and discuss with him legislation in which he or his organization is interested, unless he registers and acknowledges himself to be a lobbyist.

Mr. President, I had not intended to discuss this title of the bill at this time. I wish it clearly understood that I am not by any means condemning the objectives of the title. I think it has a great deal of merit in it. But I should like to see some of these questionable provisions of it modified or amended in such a way as to safeguard the rights of a citizen, whether he represents an organization or whether he comes to Washington in his capacity as an individual, to contact his representatives in Congress at his pleasure and at their convenience. I do not think we should go so far as to abridge that right. I think professional lobbyists—people who are earning their livelihood as lobbyists and who are here in Washington in the performance of that duty or in pursuance of that profession—should be required to register, and I believe that full information should be spread upon the record with regard to their activities—how they are financed, by whom they are paid, and what their expenditures are.

Mr. President, before I was interrogated about the lobbying title of the bill, I was discussing paragraph (2), on page 44 of the bill, and I was referring to the various experts who are to be established as senior specialists in the Library of Congress. I was mentioning the various fields in which such senior specialists would serve, and the last one I mentioned was international affairs. Upon referring to that portion of the bill again, I find that the next field which is mentioned is international trade and economic geography. I do not know what economic geography would involve. Geography is just geography to me. I do not know that there is any economy in it except with reference to the size of the map which may be printed. But I do not know what is meant by international trade and economic geography. Of course, in connection with the field of international trade there are various agencies of the Government which already function, particularly within the Department of Commerce and the Department of State. The Department of State is clothed with authority to negotiate trade agreements. I believe in this bill we are being asked to expand the

Government by creating additional bureaus and agencies, and thereby necessitating an additional expense on the part of Government instead of increasing its efficiency.

There would also be a specialist on price economics. There is much concerning this section of the bill which I do not understand.

There would also be an expert on social welfare. We have a Social Security Administration within our Government at the present time. I do not know what need we would have of a specialist in social welfare.

There would also be a specialist in the field of taxation and fiscal policy. There is already a Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. We are now being asked to provide for an expert, and furnish him with a staff which would deal with the subject of taxation and fiscal policy. What I have already said with reference to standing committees applies in this instance. We have been asked to furnish the Finance Committee with four experts to assist in solving the technical problems associated with tax legislation.

We are also to supply an expert on the subject of transportation and communications. But, Mr. President, we have already taken care of such matters.

We would also supply an expert on the subject of veterans' affairs. Mr. President, what is there about veterans' affairs which cannot be administered by the Veterans' Administration? Under the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress we would furnish an expert on the subject of veterans' affairs. How many veterans would write to that person and inquire with reference to what they must do in order to secure the adjustment of their claims or with reference to other matters of that kind? The only thing which I can see that this expert would do would be to issue a booklet of some kind on the subject, perhaps, on the GI bill of rights. But the Veterans' Administration has already provided information which would be embraced within such a book. Moreover, Mr. President, we have already established various offices throughout the Nation to which the veteran may go and talk directly with some person whom the Government has appointed to give to the veteran the assistance which he requires.

Mr. President, I again emphasize that the bill in its present form merely augments, expands, multiplies, and increases the present number of agencies and bureaus of the Government, all of which would be done at an increased cost and without resulting in any materially increased efficiency.

Mr. President, with reference to the reorganization of committees as proposed in the bill; as I have already said, I am not opposed to the plan which has been proposed. I do not say that it is the best plan which could be offered. Upon further study of it I may have some suggestions to make. I have not served in the Senate as long as some other Members of the Senate have served, and I should prefer to leave final judgment with respect to that phase of the bill to Senators who have been Members

of the Senate longer than I have, and who have served on various committees longer than I have served.

So far as I know, the joint committee has done a very good job with respect to the various proposed committees which are dealt with in the bill. It may be that some functions which have been assigned to some of the committees should be assigned to other committees. But I approve of the recommendation in connection with the reduction of the present number of standing committees, and the provision that they shall meet jointly whenever it is possible and feasible to do so in connection with the study of proposed legislation. I approve of the resultant curtailment of the amount of time which it would be necessary for Members of the Congress to consume in connection with legislative matters, and that statement applies also with reference to departmental heads and their staffs. For example, there may be a hearing taking place in the other House in regard to a flood-control bill. Reporters are engaged to report the hearings before the committee, and those hearings are printed. The bill later comes to this body and is referred to a committee. Hearings are again held on the bill, and there is much duplication of work. Mr. President, there is the place to begin to reorganize the Congress.

Mr. President, instead of moving to strike out subsection (a) or section 243 on page 50 of the bill, I should prefer to move to strike out all of title 2, except certain provisions thereunder which may contain much merit. I may say that I believe the Johnson amendment which was agreed to on page 40 of the bill with reference to the manner of selecting experts for the various committees, was a decided improvement of the bill. Certainly, every committee should have the prerogative, jurisdiction, and authority to select its own employees. In carrying out the same philosophy which is contained in the Johnson amendment as adopted by the Senate, I assert that there is no need for the establishment of a personnel director. Every committee, in my judgment, should have the right to employ its own clerical staff and its own experts. The Johnson amendment would allow that to be done. I do not know what the practice has been in the past; I do not know whether it has been the prerogative of the chairman of a committee to select the entire staff of the committee. Perhaps there may be some objection to that practice. If so, it has been corrected by the Johnson amendment. Under the bill now with the Johnson amendment the selection is made by the majority of the committee. The democratic process is invoked, and the majority of the committee selects the members of its staff and discharges them whenever it sees fit to do so. That is the way it should be done. That is why I feel the way I do with reference to the pages in the United States Senate.

I believe that the adoption of this section of the bill might be interpreted throughout the country as meaning that the present system which is pursued in connection with the selection of pages has not proved to be successful, that the

pages are not efficient, that there is a need for reorganizing the system which is used in connection with the employment of pages, and that some person should be employed to screen them, and determine finally that they must be residents of the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia or else they will be ineligible to serve.

Mr. President, to one section of this bill I desire to make special reference. It meets with my approval and I want to commend the committee for including it in the bill. I refer to the provision on page 26, section 122. It is in line with what I have been saying with respect to what is needed basically to reorganize the Congress so as to give it greater efficiency. Section 122 provides:

The standing committees of the two Houses are authorized to hold joint hearings with respect to subject matter within their respective jurisdiction.

I suggest, Mr. President, that after the word "authorized" there should be inserted an amendment reading, "and directed, whenever practicable and feasible, to hold joint hearings with respect to subject matters within their respective jurisdictions."

When I offer that amendment, as I expect to do in the course of these proceedings, I hope it will be agreed to, because it is the very crux of any proposal to reorganize Congress if there is a desire to prevent duplication of effort and the wasteful expenditure of time.

There are other provisions of the bill which I expect to discuss when I offer another amendment which I have had printed and which is lying on the desk.

One of the ways to increase the efficiency of Congress and to conserve its time and to provide for greater economy and for better government, in my judgment, is, after the Congress enacts legislation, to follow through the administration of the legislation by the executive departments of the Government. We need to find some way by prescribing a formula or providing machinery, to obviate the necessity for the creation of special committees. Many special committees could be eliminated. This bill prohibits the creation of any special committees in the future. I do not know that it would be a proper solution of the question or a wise policy to enact a law absolutely prohibiting under any circumstances the creation of a special committee. I do not think, however, the provision relating to special committees has any great significance because all we would have to do would be simply to pass a resolution saying that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is hereby created a special committee to do this or to do that. That is all we would have to do to get around that provision of the bill. What I think is needed is to set up a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress, to serve as a continuing committee, a permanent committee, and charge it with the duty and responsibility of making such investigations as the Congress may authorize from time to time, or to investigate on complaints made to it, or to Members of Congress, which the committee feels have such

merit as to warrant an investigation, or to act on its own initiative.

To me the important thing in order to obviate the duplication which now occurs, is to have a standing joint committee to conduct investigations. We have had many instances of a House committee investigating the OPA, for instance, or some other activity of administrative agencies of the Government, and at the same time a special committee of the Senate or a subcommittee of one of the standing committees of the Senate conducting a similar investigation, making an inquiry into the same subject matter and into the same general complaints. That would be obviated, and the Congress could make some progress toward streamlining itself and avoiding the necessity for duplicating overlapping activities on the part of the two Houses, by having one joint committee do that work.

When I offer the amendment which I have sent to the desk, and which is printed and on the desks of Senators, I shall point out the duties and functions, as set forth in the bill and in the report of the committee, which are imposed upon the new Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. By forming the two committees, the House committee and the Senate committee into a joint committee, for the purpose of making the investigations and studies which the pending legislation directs each committee—at least, each Senate committee—to make, this work could be done, if the committee were properly staffed with men competent to assist it, and a better surveillance could be kept over the different administrative and executive agencies of the Government.

Unless that is done, Mr. President, I do not believe that the provisions of the pending bill will solve that problem. I do not have the provision before me at the moment, but under the terms of the bill each standing committee is authorized or required in the future to follow through in the administrative departments of the Government all legislation and laws that come under the committee's jurisdiction, see to it that the laws are properly administered, and to keep informed as to the policies of the department, or branch, or agency, or bureau of the Government that is administering a law which the particular committee may have handled and may have reported. I assume the provision would apply to such laws as may previously have been enacted and which would normally have been handled by the committee in question.

Mr. President, that is all right so far as it goes, and if the committee could find time to do it, that would be of some benefit, and I think they would do it. I would not want to remove that provision from the bill. I think it ought to remain in the bill. If the committees have the time and if they will undertake such work, I think this provision of the bill would serve a good purpose.

Mr. President, one of the most important reforms we need in this Government is to make governmental agencies more responsive to the elected repre-

sentatives of the people. That is one of the great problems confronting us.

I am sure every Member of the Senate has had similar experiences to some I have had. No matter how meritorious may be the complaints we have from our constituents, we know what occurs. We go down to a Government agency to present the matter, and actually we contact a youth who has been placed at the head of a division, a young man who may never have had 1 day's practical experience in the line of work of which he is put in supervision, but who has been given authority and jurisdiction, indeed the power, to tell a United States Senator that he does not know what he is talking about; that he is running that show, and he is going to make this order and make that one.

Mr. President, I am sure every Senator has had some such experience. I know it is impossible for the Senate or the Congress to retain absolute control. Some power must be delegated, but there should be a follow-up on these agencies by the Congress, with sufficient persuasion and influence to supervise their administration of the law, so that the Congress could keep advised as to whether their interpretation of the law was in accordance with the will and intent of the Congress at the time the law was passed.

We do not have that power now. The committee which I would set up would have duties along the lines of those prescribed for the committee to be set up under the bill, on expenditures in executive departments. The joint committee I would set up would be charged with continuing duties.

Mr. President, we get many complaints, some of which are justified, some of which are fully warranted, some of which are meritorious. I get some complaints, and I am sure every Senator does, asking me to investigate this or investigate that in some agency in my State. Some constituent will say, "I want an investigation made. They have done this or have done that." I cannot go down and investigate personally. I have no authority to do so. I could go and make some inquiry if I had the time, but, of course, I do not have the time, and other Senators do not. I cannot leave my office every time I receive a complaint and go and make an investigation. So, when I get such a letter, all I can do is to call up, or we write this or that bureau, and the head of the bureau makes the investigation. He sends out his own staff to investigate his own employees, and 99 times out of a hundred he comes back with some explanation sufficient to satisfy him that nothing is wrong.

I have in mind an instance to which I shall refer and which I shall discuss when the OPA measure is before the Senate. There is a case in my State in which I think there was a flagrant violation of duty on the part of a public servant. Yet the cloak of protection is thrown around him, and he is holding his job today. I have no way of investigating such things, but in this instance I happen to have this man's own letter, over his own signature, which is irrefutable, and which is sufficient, in my judgment, to indicate

that he was proceeding on a policy that was contrary to every concept of the duty of a public servant.

Mr. President, it is cases like that which are brought to our attention. I am sure we get many complaints in which there is no merit whatever, but we do get complaints of such a character and nature that they should be investigated. I can write a letter, any other Senator can write a letter, and get an answer, but if we had the joint committee which I shall propose in the amendment I shall submit, if such a joint committee were created by the Congress, properly and adequately staffed as a permanent committee, when a complaint of this nature, when a dereliction of duty of this character, was brought to our attention, instead of writing the chief of the department or calling him on the telephone and having him make some sort of an investigation by his employees, while that is the only way he has of doing it, and then making a report to us, if the committee thought there was any merit in the complaint, or believed there was prima facie justification for the complaint being made, the committee could not only call in the chief and have him explain with regard to his policy in connection with matters involved in the complaint, but the joint committee could subpoena any employee, or could have his chief require that employee in our State to appear before the committee and give an account and report, and give testimony with regard to his activities.

Once such a committee has been set up, and has been functioning a short time, we will not have so many of these complaints. The employees will know that the eyes of Congress are still upon them.

Ah, Mr. President, too frequently today we pass legislation and delegate powers. We have nothing to do with who is employed. We do as we are asked to do here now with reference to the employees of the Senate, give some fellow a big job, and it is his responsibility to get the employees, and he gets them. Then the Congress has lost touch, has lost contact. The only contact we have is by going and pleading and begging for something which we think is right.

The joint committee I propose is not to be a new committee. We would, in effect, be doing exactly what the bill in section 122, which I read, actually is intended to do, but does not adequately do; that is, set up one committee composed of two presently existing committees, one of the House and one of the Senate, charged with responsibility for the supervision of the efficiency and expenditures in the executive departments of the Government.

Once that committee is set up and functioning those who would place distorted interpretations upon the laws Congress passes in order to serve their own ideas of what the law is and how they want it to function could immediately be called before this committee, and there could be thrashed out the question of the interpretation of the law and the practices they are pursuing under it.

If that committee disagreed with the officials and found their practices to be wrong, if they did not desist from them upon being advised how the committee felt about it, the committee would be in position to report, and the bill would require that the committee make a report to the Congress, and any member of the committee would then be in position to stand here on the floor of the Senate and make a report about it, and indicate the attitude of the affected agency or public servant acting contrary to the will of the Congress in the interpretation of the law, and in the application of it, and in the practices being pursued in connection with that agency.

Mr. President, that will help us streamline Congress. We will not have to appoint a special committee to investigate the OPA, we will not have to appoint a special committee to investigate the sale of surplus property, we will not have to appoint a special committee to look into war contracts, and to look into this, that, or the other. There would be this joint committee to make the investigations. There would not be duplication. The committee would make its report to Congress annually, or at any time, would report on the efforts to bring about changes. If they found the law susceptible to interpretation that really violated the will of Congress, the committee could immediately report a bill to Congress to correct the evil, and recommend the necessary amendment or change in the original law so that it would no longer permit of the distorted interpretation placed upon it.

That, Mr. President, will bring about efficiency. That is the type of reorganization needed. That is what should be done by Congress. Instead of wasting our time here in trying to set up a personnel director for page boys we ought to bring more closely under the will of the Congress those who are administering our laws, so they will be more responsive to the will of the citizens of the Nation who in public affairs speak only through their elected representatives.

I want to bring the Government closer to the people, nearer to the people. I want to bring the Government back to the people. One way to take it farther from the people is to put these little page boys under a personnel director. If the staff of experts provided by the bill is set up and if several other things provided by the bill are done it will result in moving the Government farther and farther from the people themselves; it will be less and less in touch with the people; it will be farther from the reach of the people, and the people will wield less influence on government.

Mr. President, the people have no one to appeal to other than Congress. They can write to the OPA and other agencies and state their problems. I could use any other agency of government, but I make reference to OPA because it is much in the minds of the people at this time. People either want to continue OPA in some form or are against it entirely. So I use OPA simply as an illustration. The point I make is that any citizen who feels that he has been wronged by the OPA or

that he has been mistreated by some of its representatives, or unjustly dealt with by reason of some of its regulations, or has been unjustly accused by it, may write in and make complaint. It is contended that those so injured can go to the courts for relief, but from my observations of the past I would say that there is very little relief such an individual can obtain in the courts.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Talking about bureaucracies, has it not occurred to the Senator from Arkansas that if we were to enact this bill into law there would be established here in our legislative bodies a bureaucracy in one of its worst forms, under which we would have a director who is to recommend and practically to select the employees of the Senate, as well presumably later on of the House; that those employees will in effect be under his control and under his domination, and that as time goes on and the present membership of this body is succeeded by other members this bureaucracy will be so installed here, its members will have such a dominion over the councils of committees and of the whole legislative process, because they are going to be associated with every committee, that we are going to have a permanent bureaucracy here in our own legislative body.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is exactly what we are doing by this bill, Mr. President. We are simply setting up, as I said the other afternoon, a super civil service without it being in civil service. The Director makes his own plans. It is said he must submit them to Congress, but I call attention to the fact that he employs whom he pleases, he employs as many as he pleases, he fixes their salaries himself. The salaries are not fixed by the Congress, but this Director fixes the salaries. Of course Congress would have to make an appropriation for the salaries. By doing the things to which I have called the attention of my colleagues today we are creating another bureaucracy, as the Senator from Louisiana has said. Apparently we do not have enough of bureaucracy in the executive departments, so we are bringing a bureaucracy here into the legislative division. If we do that, Mr. President, the Congress will simply be abdicating its responsibility to its constituents.

Mr. OVERTON. Not only that, but it will be abdicating its influence.

Mr. McCLELLAN. When Senators and Representatives lose their influence they cannot help their constituents. That is the very point I am making. I am not going to sing like a honey bee around these bureaucrats so that I may get for my constituents what they are entitled to receive. I am going to do what I think is right, and ask for justice and proper consideration. But I am not going to humiliate myself or my position or my constituency by going to some personnel director and begging for some little favors. I am not going to do that while I am a United States Senator if I can help it.

I shall try to keep this measure from becoming law in its present form. I hope we can succeed in doing that.

I do not see why the wisdom of a United States Senator or the collective wisdom of the United States Senate is not adequate for the selection of the little page boys for the Senate. Another thing, Mr. President, the matter of the selection of page boys does not take up much of the time of Senators. If a vacancy occurs a Senator selects a boy to serve as a page, and he is on that Senator's patronage, but he will never require him to do anything in the world in return. What the Senator has done is to give that boy an opportunity he may never otherwise have gotten. He will be given the opportunity for an education. The boy will be given the opportunity to satisfy his ambition to watch the United States, and the Congress function. That, Mr. President, will be an inspiration to that boy. Many pages in the past, who have served in Congress, have drawn inspiration from the deliberations of this and the other body. They have been fascinated by their experience, and have become desirous of entering the public service. They have gone back to their constituency in later years and asked them to confer upon them the honor which they have seen conferred upon Members of Congress. They have asked their constituents to repose in their confidence to represent them in the legislative halls of the State or of the Nation.

Mr. President, I recall when I was a mere boy I had the ambition to serve as a page in the legislature of my State. I did not have the opportunity for some reason to serve as a page. But also, Mr. President, from my earliest days I had a desire and ambition to some day serve in the United States Congress. My father was a farmer. I had no more opportunity afforded me than thousands upon thousands of young boys in my State whose fathers were in a situation comparative to that of my own father. My father named me for a Member of Congress. All through the years that in itself inspired in me the ambition to become a Member of Congress. When I was 8 years old I wrote a letter to that Member of Congress for whom I was named, John S. Little, from the Second Congressional District of my State, and told him of my labors for that week in the fields, told him how much cotton I had picked during that time. I received a reply from him. I still have that letter and I cherish it. He wrote me of course as he might write to any other boy and commended me for my labors and predicted that some day I might aspire to fill a high position in the Government.

Mr. President, that was an inspiration to me. Is it not an inspiration to these boys? Every one of them will say that it is. If it is, why do we wish to limit appointments to boys in the District of Columbia? Can we with good conscience vote to make ineligible a boy from Virginia, a boy from Louisiana, or a boy from Texas? I will not vote to say to a boy from Arkansas, "You may want to be a page, but the only way you can become one is to get your father and mother

to move to the District of Columbia, and then take it up with the Personnel Director to see if he will let you serve." That simply means that we would exclude boys from the States.

A Senator could not have a boy appointed unless he courted the favor of the Personnel Director. I never did like to do things that way. I like to ask for things on their merits, and if I am entitled to them, get them. That is the way I want to keep it. That is the way it is now. If the Committee on Rules assigns to me a page position for my State, I want someone in my State to have it. If a position as elevator operator is assigned to my State, if someone from my State wishes to work in Washington so as to have an opportunity to further his education, I want him to have it. He is entitled to it, just as a man from any other State is entitled to a position assigned to that State. Other Senators may vote as they please, but I will not vote to make the boys of my State ineligible for any of these opportunities that may be afforded in Washington.

We hear a great deal of talk about the patronage system. I am sure that it has been abused. But I say to Senators that there are some abuses in the civil service that outshone anything that ever occurred under the patronage system. It was said that we would be rid of the problem when Government employees were placed under civil service. It was expected that we would not be bothered with it any more. But after an employee has served for a time in the civil service he thinks he is entitled to a promotion. He wants his Senator or Representative to get him promoted to a higher grade. Perhaps he wants a transfer to some other desk, or some other city. I do not know of any way, in a democracy, by which Senators and Representatives can rid themselves of the responsibilities which go with this office.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not see the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] in the Chamber. Following up the argument made by the able Senator from Arkansas, I do not think we could find a better illustration of his argument than that afforded by the very distinguished Senator from Maine, the minority leader.

Mr. WHITE entered the Chamber.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Maine made some remarks on the floor of the Senate on Saturday last, following my observations in connection with the bill. Unfortunately I had to leave the Chamber in order to attend a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, which lasted for some time. I apologized to the Senator from Maine for leaving, and expressed my regret that I could not remain to hear what he had to say. I shall not comment at this time on what he had to say. What I am pointing out is that we could not find a better illustration of what the Senator from Arkansas is speaking about than the one afforded by the Senator from Maine, with respect to his own experience.

What was his first association in the United States Senate? He told us that he was an assistant clerk to the Senate Committee on Commerce. That is the way he began his career. He became very much interested in congressional work. In my opinion there has never been any more conscientious, painstaking, hard-working, or patriotic Senator than the Senator from Maine. He deservedly occupies a very high position in this body in his own party. He deservedly commands the respect of his colleagues and of the country generally. If it had not been that he began as an assistant clerk in the Senate Committee on Commerce in years gone by, perhaps he would not have developed the interest in congressional work which caused him to be first a Member of the House, and later a Member of this body.

That is exactly the point which the Senator from Arkansas is bringing out. A boy from the Senator's own State of Arkansas whom he would like to have appointed, and who is bright and capable, might never be appointed to an assistant clerkship or clerkship in any committee of the Senate, because, perforce, there stands in the threshold a director of personnel who may not approve of him. If there had been a director of personnel perhaps the able Senator from Maine would not in his younger days have met with the approval of the director, and he might never have had that clerkship. The magnificent and illustrious career of the Senator from Maine began in an assistant clerkship to the Senate Committee on Commerce. I know that he was a fine assistant clerk to the Senate Committee on Commerce, just as he has been a magnificent and deservedly renowned Member of this great body.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I ask the Senator to yield to me only long enough to permit me to bow to the Senator from Louisiana and express my thanks for the kind things he has said. He has exaggerated to some extent; nevertheless, he has spoken in kindly terms, and I am appreciative.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I join with the Senator from Louisiana in the very kind things he has said about the able and distinguished minority leader. I also join with the Senator from Louisiana in his evaluation of the merits of this proposal.

Mr. President, I feel that each Senator should ask himself this question: If a director of personnel is established to take over these page boys, and a boy from his State desires one of the positions, will the Senator refuse to go with him to see the Personnel Director and try to have him appointed? I say to my colleagues that they will spend just as much time on the problem as they do now. The only difference will be that there will be someone to say "No" to us. We shall not get rid of any burden we now carry. That is my honest judgment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator put a question to me. He asked me, in effect, if I would go with a Maine boy to the Director of Personnel and urge his appointment. Of course, I would, and I would go in the full expectation that a boy from Maine would be so well qualified in all respects that he would receive the certification and recommendation of the Director. If he did not measure up to the standard of qualifications, I do not believe that either he or I would expect his recommendation or appointment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Senator will not ask too many questions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Senator feel that he is competent to judge whether or not a boy measures up to the requirements? How would the Director of Personnel know any more about a boy from Maine than would the Senator? I do not believe the Senator would admit that a personnel director would know more about that boy than would the Senator. I do not think he would have any better way of finding out.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator is asking questions which are somewhat embarrassing, but I am perfectly willing to answer them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not directing them to the Senator from Maine primarily. I am directing them to every Member of the Senate. I think what I have said is what is involved.

Mr. WHITE. I am perfectly willing to state my attitude toward the proposal. Of course, I would want a Maine boy appointed. Of course, I would go with him to the Personnel Director and I would recommend him to the Personnel Director. But if he did not meet the standards laid down by the Director of Personnel and if he did not commend himself to the agency we are setting up to pass upon the merits of the applicants without regard to personal or political considerations, I would not think he was entitled to appointment and I would not think he was entitled to preference over someone who did meet the standards.

That is just the point. In this whole matter the Senator from Arkansas and I are moved by personal considerations, namely, our acquaintance with the boy and our acquaintance with his father and mother and with his neighbors. But that is not the basis upon which the appointment should rest. The appointment should rest upon the boy's qualifications, as the qualifications are determined and established by the appointing head. If the boy cannot meet those specifications and if he does not measure up to them, then, however much I might like to see him appointed, he simply is not entitled to that place, over another boy who does meet the qualifications.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senator's remarks suggest another question.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if I am going to keep on suggesting questions, I shall sit down.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Well, I wish to make this observation: In the first place, the Senator from Maine is not going to recommend a boy whom he does not believe would meet the requirements. I will wager that since the Senator from Maine has been a Senator, he has not recommended a boy to be appointed a page if the boy has not met the necessary requirements. When we consider the entire situation, as applied to everyone in Congress, we readily admit that an exception might occur; but exceptions would occur no more often under the present system than they would under the proposed system.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator from Arkansas believe that a Member of the Senate who knows a boy's background and qualifications is better able to judge whether that young man measures up to the standards than an agency or an employee we might set up could?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I say to my colleague that I do not think it is necessary to set up a personnel director to supervise the employment of elevator boys and page boys for the Senate. I think such a step would be going far afield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that by virtue of setting up the civil-service system we have raised the standard of efficiency of Government employees?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not complaining about the civil-service system, but I will say that by establishing that system we have merely placed in Government jobs certain persons who have been able to meet certain requirements, and they hold those particular positions indefinitely, and the efficiency ratings they are given are often fixed on the basis of the likes or dislikes of their superiors. We cannot establish a standard or a formula for the measuring or for the evaluation of merit and at the same time guarantee that it will preclude the consideration of the personal and human equation. The personal and human equation enters into the matter all the time.

With reference to the page boys, I say we would do well to continue the present system. Under it everyone will be happier. There has not been any friction because of it or dissatisfaction with it, so far as I know, or any inefficiency on the part of any page boy who has been appointed under the present system. If any of us were informed that one of the page boys did not satisfactorily perform his duties, we would not keep him here. No Senator would. Yet it is proposed that we turn the whole matter over to a personnel director.

Mr. President, I have talked much longer than I intended to speak when I began my presentation of this matter. I did wish to take occasion to discuss some of the other provisions of the bill, and I have referred to some of them. But I wish to say in concluding my remarks that I hope the Senate will vote this section out of the bill. It has no place in it. This provision will not reorganize Con-

gress, and neither will it promote the efficiency of Congress. The provisions of title II with respect to the establishment of a personnel director would, if enacted into law, result in the setting up of another bureau and the establishment of so many experts that the Congress would be "experted" to where it would not know whether it was going or coming. The result would be to create more confusion, instead of to reduce it.

I hope my colleagues will not vote to turn the page boys over to a director of personnel. I hope that both the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives will, as individual Members of the Congress, accept in full measure the responsibilities and obligations which go with service in the Congress. I think those responsibilities embrace the duty which we owe to ourselves to pass upon the merits of those who serve us in our legislative duties. By setting up a personnel director and giving him complete authority and power in such matters, including the right to say "No" to a Senator or to a committee of Senators, or even to the whole Senate, with respect to who shall be employed, I do not believe we make progress in the interest of economy or efficiency or expedition of the business of Congress, nor do I believe such a step will serve to relieve any Senator of any work or responsibility which now rests upon him.

Mr. President, just as the Senator from Maine said a moment ago, I say that if a boy from his State wanted such a position and if he came to see the Senator about it, the Senator would go with that boy from the Senate Office Building to the Director of Personnel, and would talk with him about the matter. But if we do not establish a personnel director, all the Senator will have to do will be to pass judgment on that boy's qualifications himself. I believe that the Senator from Maine or any other Senator is just as competent to pass upon the qualifications of a page boy as would be any \$10,000-a-year director who might be employed by the Congress. Yet under the proposed system, the Senator would have to go to the Personnel Director and present the boy's case, whereas under the present system if a Senator has allocated to him the right to appoint a page, all he has to do is give him the job and place his name on the pay roll.

At the present time none of the Senate pages come from Arkansas. Nevertheless, I am unwilling to vote to make the boys of my State ineligible to appointment as pages in the Senate.

I do not know whether there will be any other discussion of this amendment; but before it is voted on, I shall hope to have a quorum present and I shall ask for the yeas and nays, in order that we may record our votes on this question.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Austin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Overton
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Bilbo	Hoey	Radcliffe
Bridges	Huffman	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bushfield	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Stanfill
Capehart	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
George	Maybank	Walsh
Guffey	Millikin	Wherry
Gurney	Moore	White
Hart	Murdock	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, when our Government was founded and the Constitution was adopted there was provision made for three separate and distinct branches—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. When they were created, they were more or less equal. But the executive branch of the Government has mushroomed into the greatest governmental bureaucracy not only this country but any other country in the world has known. The legislative branch of the Government has relatively stood still. The judicial branch has varied only insofar as the country has developed, and additional judicial divisions and district courts, appeals courts, have been made necessary as a result of increases in population and in the development of the country.

Under the leadership of the late Senator Maloney, of Connecticut, who was one of the ablest and hardest working Members of the Senate, and who realized the overworked condition of Senators and Representatives, a proposal was made to reorganize or streamline Congress. When Senator Maloney died, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress performed a service for which every thoughtful citizen of this country and every progressive-minded person, as well as the Members of Congress, should be most grateful.

The work of the committee has been long, arduous, and tedious. The committee has worked faithfully and hard. As a result of long and extended hearings, a report was made, and subsequently the bill which is now before the Senate was presented.

This committee, in a very general way, concentrated its study on ways and means by which the Senate and the House of Representatives could improve their organization. The war years, and this most important period of transition from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy, have increased the responsibilities of the American Congress and correspondingly the responsibilities and duties of every Senator and every Representative. Yet, to cope with our

ever-increasing national problems, which, under our system of government, must be solved by legislative decision, we have practically the same organization and the same work system that have been peculiar to Congress since the beginning of the Government.

It will not be denied, I am sure, that we can expect only a further increase of congressional responsibilities. Therefore, I believe, Mr. President, it has become increasingly evident to everyone that it is imperative that our legislative organization and our work system in Congress be so modernized as to enable it to deal adequately with the multitudinous problems now facing the Nation. National problems increased tremendously during the period of war; they have increased in the past year, and we can foresee nothing but a further increase in their number and complexity in the years and decades ahead.

Mr. President, I believe the committee, because of the various studies it made, the extended hearings it held, and the conscientious work it performed in connection with this problem, has rendered a distinct service to the country, culminating in the recommendations which the committee has submitted to the Congress and which, in the form of a bill, are now under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, the ever-increasing responsibilities rest not only upon the Congress as a whole, but they daily become more burdensome to the individual Members, whose time is often so divided between committee studies of issues as to make it impossible to give any single issue, whatever may be its importance, the degree of attention it merits.

Very few people, except the Members of Congress themselves, realize how involved is the situation we face. I recall very distinctly that while speaking at a meeting during the past year, a man stood up in the back of the audience and asked, "What is your position on H. R. 4943?" When I told him that I did not know what the bill was all about, he said, "Just what I thought; it is typical of the average Senator down there in Washington. You do not know what you are doing or what you are legislating upon. You do not know what the bill is about." Then I went on to try to explain to him that more than 9,000 bills were pending before the Congress, and that it was almost impossible for a Senator to be informed respecting more than the very important bills, or the bills coming before his particular committees, which might number a few hundred or perhaps a thousand or more. People have no conception of the duties the average Senator is called upon to perform.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate—and I have been here rather a brief period of time, but about 10 years—I have seen man after man in the United States Senate whom I highly respected, die from overwork. Overwork has been the primary cause of death of most of the Senators I have in mind. Senator Maloney died solely from the strain of overwork. Senator McNary, our very able floor leader, died by reason of a great accumulation of work. The same thing is true of Senator Scrugham

of Nevada, Senator Thomas of Idaho, Senator Sheppard of Texas, Senator Harrison of Mississippi, and Senator Adams of Colorado. I sat with Senator Adams on the Appropriations Committee. At that time there was not a harder-working man in the Senate than Senator Adams. He literally worked himself into his grave. Senator Pittman of Nevada and Senator Gibson of Vermont died from overwork. Senator Copeland of New York is another man who literally worked himself into his grave. The same cause, overwork, has sent many other Senators and Congressmen to their deaths. Senator BANKHEAD is very seriously ill at the moment due to the strain of overwork. Yet, with the increased responsibilities placed on the shoulders of United States Senators and Representatives, we have done practically nothing to meet the situation or to relieve Senators of the too great burdens which they are trying to carry in the performance of their duties.

Today, Senators have the terrific problem of making both ends meet. A Senator receives \$10,000 a year. A House Member, I may say, receives \$10,000 a year plus \$2,500 for expenses, an allowance which at times I have advocated on this floor should also be given to Senators, but the proposal has been killed by Members of our own body. A Senator not only has to pay the Federal income tax which every other citizen has to pay, which takes approximately one-quarter of his salary, but he must maintain two homes, one in his home State and one in Washington. He has to maintain two homes if he is to continue to represent his State in the Senate. He must travel back and forth between his State and Washington. Aside from one allowance for a round trip, he has to pay his own travel expenses. He either has to maintain a car in his home State as well as a car in Washington, or he has to get around in Washington on streetcars and by taxi, and pay for such travel out of his own pocket.

I desire to say a few words about one of the most disgusting things I have noticed in Washington. We talked about it in the Appropriations Committee today. I refer to the use of Government cars by the bureaucrats downtown. I was in Woodward & Lothrop's store the other day buying an article which I needed. While I was there, outside the store were four black Government limousines, with chauffeurs. They were not occupied by the Government officials themselves to whom the cars were assigned, but their wives or members of the family had taken the cars and were driven by Government chauffeurs on a shopping expedition.

Recently I attended a dinner in Washington which was quite widely attended. I see on the floor other Senators who were also present. It was a rainy night, and when the dinner party was over I saw Senators and their wives and Representatives and their wives running out in the rain and, getting very wet, trying to hail taxis or to get to streetcar lines. Yet more than 20 sleek black limousines, driven by Government chauffeurs, pulled up and picked up the various Govern-

ment bureaucrats and took them on their way. As I said, I saw United States Senators and Representatives and their wives get sopping wet while trying to get taxis or proceeding to streetcar lines. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] suggests to me that I did not mention that the cars in question were Government cars. I intended, of course, to say that they were Government cars, with Government-paid chauffeurs. It will be found that not only Cabinet members and other high-ranking members of the Government have the use of Government cars, but pretty nearly every little bureaucrat in Washington has such a car, and most of them have Government-paid chauffeurs. Yet there is objection not only to giving a Senator who directly serves the people an adequate salary, but objection to granting him a simple allowance for his expense account as well.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the law on this subject. We are going to do something about this matter. Some years ago Congress passed a law which prohibits the use of Government cars for private use. We checked on that matter this morning in the Appropriations Committee. I have the law before me. I shall raise that point now, and I think Congress should take steps to find out why the law is not being lived up to, and just who ought to be brought to task. I read from the law:

(b) For the maintenance, operation, and repair of any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle not used exclusively for official purposes; and "official purposes" shall not include the transportation of officers and employees between their domiciles and places of employment, except in case of medical officers on out-patient medical services and except in cases of officers and employees engaged in field work the character of whose duties makes such transportation necessary.

Then the law provides:

Any officer or employee of the Government who willfully uses or authorizes the use of any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, or of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle leased by the Government, for other than official purposes or otherwise violates the provisions of this subsection shall be suspended from duty by the head of the department or establishment concerned, without compensation, for not less than 1 month, and shall be suspended for a longer period or summarily removed from office if circumstances warrant. The limitations of this subsection (b) shall not apply to any motor vehicles for official use of the President, the heads of the executive departments, Ambassadors, Ministers, *chargés d'affaires*, and other principal diplomatic and consular officials.

I assume from that language that, very properly, the President and Cabinet members are exempt from the provision, but the law does not exempt the average little bureau head or division head downtown. What is going on is disgraceful. If it is necessary for the Congress to designate someone to enforce that provision of the law it should be done. I call it to the attention of the Senate now for the purpose of further indicating that Senators and Representatives are deprived of action which would help them to serve

the people while bureaucrats abuse privileges. Senators are now limited to 26 official long-distance telephone calls a month. Yet any third-class clerk in a Government department or agency can pick up the telephone and call San Francisco, Seattle, or any other distant point at any time of the day he wishes, and we assume that it is for official purposes. There is no accurate check on it. Yet an adequate provision for the American Congress is approached with timidity by the average Senator or Representative.

Neither the members of the committee, in spite of their long and conscientious study of congressional reorganization, nor other individual Members vitally concerned in this subject claim perfection for the bill which the Senate is now asked to approve. I have long been interested in congressional reorganization; and, insofar as possible, have encouraged the Members of Congress who have made this study for us. The bill which the committee has reported is much better than I expected would be possible. I am not in agreement with all the provisions of the bill; but instead of being against it all along the line, why can we not get together? If amendments are needed in order to perfect the legislation, let us offer the amendments and adopt them, and take a forward-looking step, rather than oppose the whole proposal.

There has been hope for the work of the joint committee from the beginning, largely due to the fact that those upon whom the committee first called for advice and suggestions were Members of Congress, who, of course, have the deepest recognition of the faults of their own organization. The bill representing the report has been followed on the floor of the Senate during the past 3 days by the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who has with interest and cooperation listened very patiently to the various objections offered by his colleagues. He has already accepted a series of amendments to bring the bill into line with what the leaders of this body consider to be the most workable system. I hope that in the final discussion today Senators will continue the procedure so far followed in the debate. I believe that this is an opportunity for every Senator who believes that the Congress should be kept abreast of the times to do his bit to place Congress in a position adequately to meet the problems of the day. His opportunity to do so is today.

Instead of opposing the entire bill, as many Senators are now doing today, and have done in the past, let us get down to the meat of the proposal and see if a workable basis cannot be found. Let us pass a bill for the modernization of Congress. The committee has given freely of its time and has worked faithfully. There is not a member of the committee who is not ordinarily overworked. The committee is composed of busy Senators and Representatives. They have done their part. Now it is the job of the Senate and the House to do their part. In my judgment, their part is not to stall or oppose generally the provisions of the bill, but to endeavor to meet the problems of the day by improving it and passing a bill which

will be a definite step in the right direction. If it does not work properly, let us correct it afterward, rather than oppose the whole thing now and get no legislation, which is very likely to be the situation if we fail to meet our responsibilities.

Many members of the public are critical of the American Congress; but I know of no one who can be more progressively interested or constructively critical than Members of Congress themselves. Every Senator present knows that he does not have adequate help in his office. Every Senator knows that unless he is financially independent he is unable to make both ends meet on his salary. The membership of the Senate should not be limited to millionaires, or to men who have outside income. The Senate of the United States should be a cross section of the citizenship of America. It should contain rich men, poor men, and men of modest means. We cannot have a cross section of America if Senators receive \$10,000 a year and must pay a quarter of it in Federal income taxes, maintain two homes, pay their own traveling expenses, and meet all the obligations which devolve upon them, such as subscriptions for this and that, and all the other expenses they are called upon to bear. It simply cannot be done.

The pending bill offers an opportunity to remedy that condition. In the bill we are not asking the Congress to approve a salary increase by itself. What the committee is saying to the American Congress is, "Let us improve all along the line. Let us establish an adequate retirement system. Let us increase salaries; but at the same time let us make ourselves more efficient so that we can more adequately cope with the problems of the day." That is a sound reason for the legislation which we are now considering.

Let me say a word about the retirement feature of the bill. Although I believe that what the bill proposes in connection with retirement is very good, I do not think it is good enough. As I understand, there is a movement on foot in the Senate to offer an amendment to strike out the retirement provisions of the bill and substitute a much more limited scale. To my mind that would be foolish in every way. We should provide adequate retirement for Members of the Congress. We provide it for generals, admirals, captains, lieutenants, sergeants, corporals, privates, and others in the Army and Navy. We have provided it for every little civil-service employee in the Federal Government. We have provided it for the judiciary, all the way down the line. Why exclude Senators and Representatives from the benefits of retirement? I would go much further than is proposed in the bill with respect to retirement.

I believe that we should encourage young men to become Members of the American Congress. Let us assume that a man becomes a Member of the Senate or the House when he is 30 years of age, spends the most productive years of his life as a Member of Congress, and then gives up his position. I think he should be protected when he is defeated or

forced to retire because of ill health, because he has given up the productive years of his life.

For example, take the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. He is a member of the opposition party, but he is a man for whom I have very high respect. The Senator from Illinois is a lawyer. If he had remained out of public life, during the most productive years of his life his ability would have enabled him to earn sufficient income adequately to provide for his retirement in the course of a few years. On the other hand, he is giving up a lucrative law practice and devoting the most productive years of his life to public service. When the time comes when his health fails or he is forced to retire, he will not have a great reserve built up, because he will have given the most productive years of his life to public service.

I say that the American Government can make no better investment than to provide adequate retirement for Members of Congress, instead of limiting the retirement privileges as they are limited in this bill, or trying to limit them further, as I understand is proposed by an amendment. I would make them very much more liberal. I intend to offer an amendment in that direction when the opportunity presents itself.

I have sat in committee rooms of the Senate for the past 10 years and have heard many Senators tell what is the matter with Congress and what we should do. We have an opportunity today to do something. I should like to see Senators who have been sitting in committee rooms and telling us privately what is wrong come to the forefront and help put this bill across. If it is not all it should be, let us try to make it better; if some of its provisions should be more liberal, let us liberalize them; if it needs to be corrected in other respects, let us correct it; but let us pass a bill which will do the job which we are called upon to do.

The other day the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] referred to the days when he began his service in the Senate. Conditions have changed since that time. Even in the 10 years I have been a Member of the Senate I have seen the problems so increased and the burdens thrown on the shoulders of United States Senators so multiplied that it is foolish to compare the present situation even with that of a few brief years ago. The situation will not improve. It was hoped that when the war was over our burdens would be gradually lifted. However, in the post-war period our problems are greater; the burdens on our shoulders are more onerous than they were at the height of the war. Let no one think for a minute that they will become any lighter. With the concentration of authority which we have in Washington today, and with Washington becoming the nerve center of America and the world, as well as the capital of this country, the work of Congress cannot be lessened. Now is our chance to do something about it.

I do not wish to take more of the time of the Senate, but I hope that this measure will not be bypassed, and I hope that we can meet the issue fairly, and

that any objections which we may have can be ironed out.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a minute, before he suggests the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, probably I am in as good a position as is any other Member of this body to express an opinion regarding what the Senator from New Hampshire has been saying. When I came to the Senate I realized that the burdens on Senators who were serious minded, as I believe most of them are, were very heavy. I have been connected with business affairs, and I have seen the trials and troubles of business in both good and bad times. But I have never seen a load that was heavier than the load which is placed upon every serious-minded Member of the Senate of the United States.

I say to you, Mr. President, that it may be some years before the people of the United States find it out; but as affairs are going, the load is too heavy for any normal man in the world to carry.

In regard to one matter which the Senator from New Hampshire has mentioned, I wish to say that I am very deeply in favor of some kind of proper pension or retirement system for the men who give up their lives to their country by service in the Senate and the House of Representatives. I do not expect to participate in such a pension, so I am free to make this statement. It is just plain common sense for the people of the United States to make provision for such a pension or retirement system. Inasmuch as our people are spending so many billions of dollars on governmental affairs, they should realize that insofar as their public servants who are giving their time, abilities, and services in the interest of preserving this great form of government and way of life are concerned, it is to the interest of the people of the United States and it is merely plain common sense to say that the situation the Senator from New Hampshire has mentioned should be corrected, and it should be corrected on a fair and just basis.

As I am speaking now, I am reminded that last year we went all the way back to the old workers on the Panama Canal and we voted to give to those who worked on the Canal from 1908 to 1914, as I recall, pensions equal to 60 percent of the salaries they received during the last 5 years of their work on the Panama Canal.

Mr. President, my only reason for speaking now is that it will be recalled that a few months ago I objected to a proposal to increase the salaries of the Members of Congress because I believed that was not the appropriate time to do so. However, I believe the present is the appropriate time to consider any increases and improvements now that the reorganization bill is before the Senate.

I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that we should pass the pending bill in some form. It may be that some amendments should be made to it; in fact, I think there are some amendments which should be adopted. But we should take this step, because it is a step in the right direction. The fact that we are discussing the affairs of Senators and Representatives in Congress is no reason for considering this measure in a light any different from that in which we would consider a measure having to do with the affairs of anyone else connected with or working for any branch or agency of the Government of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator.

I venture to say that the able Senator from New Jersey reaches his office at around 9 o'clock in the morning and leaves it late at night. I have been at my office many times late in the evening and on Saturday afternoon and during the day on Sunday, but I have never been in the Senate Office Building that I did not see one or more Senators working there still later, at almost any hour of the night. I venture to say that Senators work more hours than do any other single group of people in the Nation. The objective of this bill is to save their lives, to make this country a better country, to give our country a more progressive, efficient government, to equalize the difference between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of government which were set up when this country was founded. That is a sound objective to seek, and I hope we can obtain some action on it here today.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have been endeavoring to ascertain whether it will be possible to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to bring this bill to its final disposition this afternoon. Before proposing a unanimous-consent agreement for that purpose, I should like to suggest the amendments which I am prepared to offer if that unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

I am prepared to eliminate from the bill the references to the Congressional Personnel Director, and I am prepared to increase the membership of the Appropriations Committee from 13 to 21.

I can state the amendments which I shall offer if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to; I am now referring to the original print of the bill, which is the bill which is at the desk, and not the reprint of the bill which was made for the information of Senators, in order to show what changes had been made in the measure by way of amendment during the time it has been under consideration:

Beginning on page 35, in line 4, strike out all down to and including line 5 on page 38.

Mr. President, let me say that I shall send a copy of these amendments to the desk if it becomes necessary to do so.

On page 38, in line 7, strike out "Director" and insert "Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives"; and in line 13 strike out "the" and insert "they."

On page 41, line 12, beginning with the word "Until", strike out through the word "the" in line 15, and insert in lieu thereof the word "The."

On page 41, beginning with line 20, strike out through line 2 on page 42.

On page 43, in line 17 and 18, strike out "upon recommendation and certification of the Director of Congressional Personnel."

On page 50, beginning in line 20, strike out subsection (a) of section 243.

On page 51, in line 3, strike out "said" and insert "Congressional."

Also reletter the sections.

On page 6, in line 20, strike out the word "thirteen" and insert the words "twenty-one."

The effect of these amendments, as I stated a few months ago, will be to eliminate from the bill the creation of the office of Director of Congressional Personnel and to eliminate from title 2 any references to his duties and powers, and to make in the remaining sections of title 2 the corresponding changes which logically flow from the fact that this would be a proposal to eliminate that office from the measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on the pending measure and all amendments and motions thereto shall be concluded at not later than 4:30 p. m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just a moment, Mr. President. In order to obtain that consent I believe it would be necessary, under the rule, to have a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order to obtain an agreement to limit debate on a measure it is not necessary to have a quorum present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the necessity for having a quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A request for limitation of debate does not require the presence of a quorum. The request is simply for a limitation on debate, and it is not necessary to have a quorum present in order to provide for such a limitation.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Am I to understand that the amendments to which the Senator has referred have already been formally agreed to by the Senate?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I said that, if I could obtain the unanimous-consent agreement which I requested, I would offer the amendments.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Does the Senator offer them now?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would prefer first to obtain unanimous consent. Unanimous consent has not yet been granted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought it had been granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in view of the objection I have only one thing to say with reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The reason that the joint committee made its recommendation with regard to the pages of the Senate and of the House is that it felt Congress was not properly discharging its responsibilities in reference to the youths who come to Washington to serve as pages in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. I have been interested in their welfare, although I have never recommended the appointment of a boy to be a page in the Senate. I know that they are hard working and efficient youths, but I believe that too few Senators realize that many of them come to Washington on the threshold of adolescence, and are here frequently without friends, relatives, or guardians. Many of them live in boarding houses. The long hours which they are required to serve creates a very difficult problem so far as their education is concerned, and in order to comply with the requirements of the compulsory school attendance act a quasi-private school has been created and is now located in the subterranean passages of the Capitol. The head of the school, Mr. Kendall, and the teachers of the school have made the best of a very bad situation. One of the schoolrooms in the Capitol has no outside ventilation whatever. The average attendance in that one room affords only 100 cubic feet of air space to each pupil. Senators will recall that the report with reference to the horrors of the concentration camp at Buchenwald disclosed that the inmates of that horrible institution were allowed only 85 cubic feet of air space a person. At the moment, and for a number of years past, in the classroom to which I have referred the students have available only 15 more cubic feet of air space than was allowed to the Nazi victims in the concentration camp at Buchenwald.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am very hopeful that the Senator from Wisconsin will restate his unanimous consent request, because I believe that some of us did not quite comprehend the effect of it when he made his request in the first instance.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be very happy to restate it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on Senate bill 2177 be brought to a close by not later than 4:30 p. m. today.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have a very important amendment which I wish to offer, and I do not believe I could agree to the unanimous consent request which the Senator from Wisconsin has made. My amendment would restore that section of the bill which relates to the payment of retirement funds, and puts the matter on the same basis as that with

reference to civil-service employees of the Government. As presently written, this provision would give to Members of Congress nearly twice as much in money benefits as is received by those who are employed under civil service. I would want ample time in which to discuss the matter, because I consider it to be very important.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, would it be agreeable to the able Senator from Virginia if, following the amendments which I intend to offer, the disposal of which I do not believe would require more than a few minutes, we should devote the remaining time until 4:30 on the Senator's amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Is it the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin to allow an hour and a half for the discussion of my amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from Virginia would be allowed until 4:30 o'clock whatever time remained after the adoption of the amendments which I have indicated I shall offer. I do not believe that the consideration and disposal of my amendments would consume more than a very few minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suggest that the Senator from Wisconsin allow his unanimous-consent request to stand with reference to the amendments which he will offer, and all other amendments which may be offered with the exception of the Byrd amendment, that all of them be disposed of by 3:30 o'clock this afternoon, and the remaining time until 4:30 o'clock be divided equally between the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Wisconsin. In that way we would all have an opportunity to offer amendments and have them disposed of.

Mr. BYRD. I believe that the amendment which I will offer could not very well be disposed of in less than an hour and a half.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that what the Senator from Wisconsin is seeking to do is to bring to a close the debate so that we may vote on the bill today. I think that he might well extend the time which he has suggested to 5 o'clock.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Very well. I am willing to modify my suggestion so as to extend the time to 5 o'clock, and agree that the time remaining after my amendments have been disposed of until 5 o'clock shall be divided between the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and myself.

Mr. BYRD. With the understanding that the time which shall actually be allowed for a discussion of the amendment may be not less than an hour and a half.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe that there will be more than an hour and a half left after disposing of the amendments which will be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, because it is not yet 3 o'clock and disposal of the amendments which the Senator will offer will not consume more than a very few minutes. I believe that perhaps there will be no debate on them at all.

Mr. BYRD. If any change in my amendment is to be suggested, no less than an hour and a half should be allowed in debate on the amendment before it is voted upon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have an amendment which I shall wish to offer. I shall not consume very much time in discussing it. If I may be given an opportunity to offer it I will agree not to consume over 5 minutes. The amendment now lies on the desk, and, so far as I am concerned, it may be voted upon now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the unanimous consent request which has been made by the Senator from Wisconsin is granted, it will not preclude the offering of further amendments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; but when a larger number of Senators are present I shall briefly state what my amendment proposes to do. I have already used a great deal of time of the Senate in discussing the bill, and it is not my purpose unnecessarily to delay a final vote upon it.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that if the agreement to vote at 5 o'clock is entered into, and he proceeds to offer his amendments, I believe that we can vote on them without delay? I do not believe they will occasion any debate. After they are disposed of the Senator from Arkansas could offer his amendment, and have it disposed of at least prior to 3:30 o'clock. We would then have until 5 o'clock to consider and dispose of the amendment which the Senator from Virginia has said he desires to offer.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have an amendment also which I wish to offer at the proper time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, let us first get this other matter straightened out.

I ask unanimous consent that further debate on Senate bill 2177, and all the amendments and motions relating thereto, shall be concluded by 5 o'clock p. m. today; that not later than 3:30 o'clock p. m. today, the amendment which the Senator from Virginia has said he will offer will be the pending amendment, and that the control of such time as remains between that hour and the time when the amendment shall be voted upon by the Senate shall be divided equally between the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, before that motion is put, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to refer to page 43 of the bill. On page 43 it is provided that it shall be the duty of the Legislative Reference Service "to assist representatives of the press and radio in reporting on the proceedings of Congress, and for this purpose the Director of the Legislative Reference Service is authorized to assign competent persons to the press and radio galleries of the Senate and the House of Representatives, who shall make available relevant records, debates, and background data."

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that that is in conflict with one of the Senate rules which provides that those who are employed in legislative or executive departments of the Government cannot be admitted to the press or radio galleries. I think that is a very good rule and should be preserved, that no agency of the Government should have access to the Senate galleries either the press section of it or the radio section, and thereby have an opportunity, by propaganda or otherwise, to color the news which is sent out. I should like to ask the Senator if he would accept an amendment to strike that out.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, that provision is in conformity with a provision contained in the report of the joint committee, the sole purpose of it being to furnish a digest of bills and reports, and thus to facilitate the work in the press gallery. I personally think it would be a very good service.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Wisconsin and I myself, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, had an understanding that only certain specific rules of the Senate would be abrogated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We had an agreement, as I understood, that we would not go outside of the recommendations of the report of the joint committee.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will recall, we had a definite list of the rules which would be changed under the bill, and it was understood that no others would be taken up.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If there is any question about it, Mr. President, I should certainly want absolutely to stick to the letter of my understanding with the Senator from Virginia, but I assumed that we were within the understanding in providing this paragraph to carry out the recommendation of the report of the joint committee.

Mr. BYRD. It abrogates an existing rule relating to the press gallery.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator feels that it is not within the purview of the report which the Rules Committee made in recommending the creation of the special committee to consider the bill, I should certainly want to eliminate it.

Mr. BYRD. I shall offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it seems to me there is another vital reason why this provision should go out altogether. I do not think that we should provide by this bill any service which could in any sense be interpreted as an attempt to tutor the representatives of the press and the radio. We should not, it seems to me, in any circumstances undertake to control the sources of information of the press and the radio.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There certainly was no such intention.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Knowing the Senator as I do, I am certain he had no such purpose, and I recommend most earnestly that he himself move to strike the provision from the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be glad to accept the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, without admitting the interpretation which the Senator from

Wyoming has placed upon the intent of the joint committee in making its recommendation, because I feel it is not in conformity with the report which the committee made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, was the Chair putting the request for unanimous consent for voting on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. BILBO. I wish to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is already agreed to.

Mr. BILBO. I had expressed to the leader that I wanted to speak on the bill and I would not have time to get through before 5 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate would be in order under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I send forward the amendments I desire to offer and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on page 35, line 4, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 5 on page 38.

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 38, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "Director" and to insert "Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives"; and on line 13, to strike out "he" and insert "they."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, line 13, beginning with the word "Until", it is proposed to strike out through the word "the" in line 15, before the word "professional", and to insert in lieu thereof the word "The."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, beginning with line 20, it is proposed to strike out through line 2 on page 42.

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 43, lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to strike out ", upon recommendation and certification of the director of Congressional Personnel,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 50, beginning in line 20, it is proposed to strike out subsection (a) of section 243; and on page 51, line 3, to strike out "said" and insert "Congressional."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed that the subsections be relettered in conformity with the amendments just made.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is now offering these amendments all together as one amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They have been agreed to seriatim.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is another amendment pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments just agreed to were those offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand, but there was already an amendment pend-

ing, and I desire to make a statement about it. The amendments which have just been agreed to incorporate the amendment I had offered to strike out certain language in the bill. The amendment has already been acted on, but my amendment was still pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk advises the Chair that the Senator's amendment was covered in the action taken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to have the RECORD show that in view of the action taken I withdraw the amendment I previously offered, and which was the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on page 6, line 20, I move to strike out the word "thirteen" and insert the word "twenty-one."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask for its present consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. For what purpose?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To make an inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. HILL. I think it will take but a moment to dispose of my amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What disposition has been made of the amendment on page 44, lines 21 to 25?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Whose amendment was that?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am merely seeking information.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood the Senator from Virginia to make the statement that he intended to offer an amendment to strike out the provision to which he referred.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has not been disposed of?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; it has not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the amendment on page 44, line 21?

Mr. BYRD. That is a different amendment. The amendment to which I referred was in the middle of page 43.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Apparently we have different prints.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will let us dispose of my amendment, I think it will take but a moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

Mr. HILL. I ask that my amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 69, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

(1) Any claim arising from the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when the Tennessee Valley Authority went into the Tennessee Valley, as we know, it took the place of private utility companies in most of the States now served

by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Of course, the people in that valley had certain rights to file claims against the private utility companies.

When we wrote the basic Tennessee Valley Authority Act, we permitted such rights to be exercised against the Tennessee Valley Authority exactly as they could have been exercised against the private utility companies. In order to make sure that the pending bill does not interfere with any rights in the Tennessee Valley, so far as the Tennessee Valley Authority is concerned, I offer this amendment, and I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will agree to accept it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was not on the floor on Saturday, being out of the city, and I find in a print of the bill before me—I do not know exactly how to identify it except that it is the print which contains many italicized amendments—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those are the amendments which have been agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In section 205 there appears a paragraph numbered paragraph (h), which reads as follows:

No individual who is employed as a professional staff member of any committee as provided in this section shall be eligible for appointment to any office or position in the executive branch of the Government for a period of 5 years after he shall have ceased to be such a member.

My inquiry is, Has that amendment been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was agreed to at the time the other amendments were adopted, and is incorporated in the bill which incorporated the amendments adopted up to that time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It seems to me that is a strikingly awkward and short-sighted provision, in that it means that, so far as the employees of the Senate and House are hereafter concerned, their chief source of employment after they are separated from Congress will be as lobbyists. They cannot go into the executive branch of the Government, but there is no prohibition against their serving special interests as lobbyists. It seems to me that we should not undertake to place such a restriction upon the employees of the Senate and the House, and I wonder what the source of the amendment was. It certainly was not in the committee report, was it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offered the amendment because there was apprehension expressed to me that if committee staff members were in a position where they could move from the committees to the executive branch of the Government without any restriction there might be a tendency for them not to serve the committees impartially, but to have their eyes on preferred employ-

ment in the executive branch of the Government.

I want to emphasize that the amendment does not apply to anyone except the four staff members who are to be appointed to the new committees. It was the purpose of the Senator from Wisconsin to create a situation whereby they would be beholden to the committee, and not be tempted to change their employment and to go to departments downtown. Some Senators pointed out to me privately that even in their own offices they are constantly losing employees at a time when they become most valuable to them, because the employees can find better positions in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The plan of the Senator then was to create a special class of indentured public servants. This seems to me to be an invasion of elementary freedom. I can certainly understand the provision of law which prohibits officials of the executive departments practicing law before their departments for a period of 2 years after they have resigned, but to prohibit an employee of the Senate or the House from seeking employment in the executive branch of the Government or having an appointment in the civil service seems to be an extraordinary legislative procedure.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say that the whole purpose with respect to these four staff assistants to the committees is to secure persons who will serve the committees and will be in an independent position, and thus enable the committees to have the service of men and women of training and experience who will impartially evaluate the material the committees receive not only from persons interested in legislation outside the Government, but also from the executive branch of the Government. I do not see anything wrong in making that a condition of employment. If a person wants to accept employment in the executive branch of the Government he may do so; but if he becomes a member of a committee staff, I think he should be prohibited from taking employment in the executive branch of the Government for a period of time after he has severed his connection with the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it seems to me that the inevitable result of this provision will be to reduce the character and grade of the persons who will accept employment.

I should like to ask unanimous consent that that amendment may be reconsidered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I could not grant unanimous consent for that purpose. Of course the Senator can move to do so. But I think it is a very sound provision. We are proposing here salaries between \$6,000 and \$8,000 a year, and I think we are entitled to have these persons enter this service with the idea of serving the committees of Congress, and not of using such service as a stepping stone into the executive branch of the Government. The desire here is to

strengthen the Congress, not the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A much better way to do that, it seems to me, would be to make it a condition precedent that a person accepting such a provision should enter into a contract for a specified period instead of saying to such an employee, "After you have severed your connection with the Congress, after you have been discharged perhaps, after you have voluntarily retired, avenues of employment in the executive branch are closed to you for 5 years."

Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin is unwilling to grant unanimous consent, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming, that the vote by which the amendment on page 42, after line 8, was adopted be reconsidered.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to strike out on page 43, subsection 4, the following provision:

(4) to assist representatives of the press and radio in reporting on the proceedings of Congress, and for this purpose the Director of the Legislative Reference Service is authorized to assign competent persons to the press and radio galleries of the Senate and the House of Representatives, who shall make available relevant records, debates, and background data.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, after line 7, it is proposed to insert the following subtitle and new sections:

Joint Committee on Administrative Practices and Efficiency.

That (a) there is hereby created a joint congressional committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on Administrative Practices and Efficiency (hereinafter referred to as the "committee.")

(b) The committee shall be composed of the Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(c) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the committee after he has ceased to be a member of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as the case may be.

(d) Vacancies in the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee.

(e) The members of the committee shall serve without additional compensation for their services, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the committee, other than expenses in connection with the meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such time as the Congress is in session.

(f) The committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

(g) The committee shall, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, employ and fix the compensation of such professional, clerical, and other employees as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the committee, and all of such employees shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties to which they may be assigned. Employees of the committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the books, documents, papers, reports, or other records of any department or agency of the Government in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

(h) No decision shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. (a) The committee is authorized and empowered to conduct investigations and studies into the practices, procedures, administrative processes, and efficiency of any department or agency of the Government or any corporation owned by the Government or in which the Government has a financial interest. The committee shall receive and consider complaints relating to the practices, procedures, administrative processes, and efficiency of any such department, agency, or corporation. The committee is empowered, upon complaint or upon its own initiative to make such investigations and studies under this subsection as in its judgment may be necessary to keep the Congress fully informed as to whether or not the laws of the United States are being properly and efficiently administered and as to whether or not additional legislation is necessary and appropriate to improve their administration. It shall be the duty of the committee to make such studies and investigations when directed by resolution of either House of Congress.

(b) The committee shall report to the Congress annually on or before the 15th of January, and at such other times as it deems advisable, the results of its investigations and studies and may make such recommendations as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title II, secs. 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

SEC. 4. Appropriations for the expenses of the committee shall be disbursed one-half by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or the vice chairman.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the amendment is offered following section 122 of the pending bill, section 122 provides:

The standing committees of the two Houses are authorized to hold joint hearings with respect to subject matter within their respective jurisdictions.

Mr. President, the amendment is in fact a bill which was introduced in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The bill, after hearings, was reported favorably, and it is now on the calendar, having been reported July 25, 1945.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to strengthen the pending bill. I have already discussed some of the merits of it in my previous remarks on the bill. The reorganization would place upon the new Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments certain duties set forth in the report. I shall not take the time to read them. This amendment would establish a standing joint committee of the two Houses and direct it to make investigations with respect to administrative affairs, and questions relating to efficiency in the administrative branch of the Government.

Under the terms of the bill as it now stands the committees would be authorized to continue to investigate, or to exercise surveillance over the particular agencies or departments of Government coming within their jurisdiction. In the past committees could have done so, but they have not done so, and they will not do so. If the committee proposed by my amendment is established, there will be a standing joint committee of the two Houses charged with the responsibility imposed in the bill. The committee will be directed to make investigations from time to time as the occasion may arise. Such a committee would obviate the necessity of creating a special committee every time some question arises.

At the time of the hearings on my bill in July 1945, I received a report from the Library of Congress as to the number of resolutions which had been introduced up to that time in the two Houses of Congress asking for particular investigations or studies. Many of them pertained to the affairs of the executive and administrative departments of Government. I have not time to read all of them, but it required 16 pages to list the number of resolutions which had been introduced up to that time calling for such investigations. I have a subsequent report from the Library of Congress up to and including February 1, 1946. There are 13 pages more listing the resolutions calling for various kinds of studies and investigations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

This amendment would not cover every investigation which might be made; but if any question should arise which the Congress wished to investigate in any department of the Government, there would be a joint committee of the two Houses ready to act. It would obviate duplication. The committee would be empowered and directed to make the investigation. Resolutions authorizing investigations could continue to be submitted and adopted by either branch of Congress, but it would not be necessary to create special committees. There

would be a standing joint committee of the two Houses to conduct the investigations.

I am now happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am exceedingly sorry to have to rise to oppose this amendment. The recommendations contained in the bill charge the expenditures and accounts committees of the two Houses with many of the same obligations contained in the pending amendment.

Secondly, we have come to the conclusion that no one committee can possibly give oversight to the actions of the myriad agencies and departments of Government and make certain that they are keeping within the bounds of the intent of Congress in delegating power to them to issue rules and regulations which have the force of law. For that reason we have placed that responsibility on the reorganized standing committees. Likewise, the bill contains a provision permitting those committees to form joint committees with their opposite numbers in the House. It seems to me that this amendment would simply duplicate what the committee has attempted to do through the standing committee. In my opinion it would disrupt the plan as we have conceived it. We feel that dumping this entire load upon one joint committee would simply swamp it. It would have neither the staff nor the time to handle the matters which might be submitted to it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield briefly. I wish to conclude.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understand, this amendment is substantially the same as the bill which the Senator introduced sometime ago as a separate measure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is that the bill which was the subject of hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That committee has already held hearings and has reported the bill. It is now on the calendar.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am in a quandary on this question. I am very much in favor of the purpose of the Senator's amendment. I was for it as an original bill. If the bill which we are considering is enacted as it now stands, there may be no need for this amendment. But if the bill is not enacted, I assure the Senator that I believe that his original bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I question the advisability of this amendment in the pending bill, but I am thoroughly in accord with the Senator's purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to have the Senator's sympathetic endorsement of the objectives of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour 3:30 having arrived, the so-called Byrd

amendment is in order. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me briefly?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas for 3 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the truth is that my amendment would not detract from the pending bill. It is said that the standing committees would do the investigating; but when an investigatory resolution is adopted a committee will have to be constituted for that purpose, whereas if we had a standing joint committee, 9 out of 10 resolutions calling for investigations would be referred to that committee. It would be, as it ought to be, a continuous investigating committee to investigate conditions in the various agencies of the Government.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the floor in my own right.

Mr. BYRD. I assume that the Senator from Arkansas wishes a vote on his amendment. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia yields for a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, may I have the floor at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Mississippi that under the unanimous consent agreement at 3:30 o'clock p. m. the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was to be considered. The Senator from Virginia was to have half the time and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] the remaining half, until 5 o'clock, when a vote was to be had on the bill and all amendments thereto.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me? I should like to offer a short amendment, consideration of which will require only a minute or two.

Mr. BYRD. I am willing to yield at this time to the Senator from Nebraska. However, I think it is very important for me to reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, after line 22, it is proposed to insert:

Every committee and subcommittee serving the Senate and House of Representatives shall report the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by it, and shall make an accounting of funds appropriated to it and expended by it, to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, at least once every 6 months, and such information shall be published periodically in the Congressional Directory when and as the same is issued, and as Senate and House documents respectively, every 3 months.

On page 29, line 23, it is proposed to change the subsection designation from "(b)" to "(c)."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this amendment would simply write into this legislation the provisions of what is known as Senate Resolution 77.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I will yield to the Senator from Mississippi, but after that I cannot yield further.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I am sorry that I came in at the eleventh hour. I arrived here this morning after having been absent for more than a month. I have not had an opportunity to read the provisions of this piece of legislation or to participate in its discussion.

From what I have seen and heard, I am frank to say that I shall be compelled to vote against it. My impression has been that the Senate has been doing a fine job in handling the Nations' business, even in the Great World War, and amid all the perplexing problems which face us as the aftermath of the war.

I love the Republicans, but I do not like to surrender so many chairmanships while the Democratic Party is in power. We have 33 committees, and most of them have plenty of business to attend to. I believe that that business can be much better attended to under the present system than under a system which would undertake to consolidate so much business in the hands of 15 or 16 committees. I think that would be a mistake governmentally. It certainly would be a mistake politically.

I wish to discuss especially section 601, by which it is proposed not only to raise the salaries of Senators and Representatives to \$15,000 a year, but to strike out the expense allowance of \$2,500 to House Members. Of course, Mr. President, all of us can use \$15,000 a year; but I think I am speaking the sentiment of the people of this country who have the \$200,000,000,000 or \$300,000,000,000 war debt to meet—and the debt will be larger than that after we get through paying the expenses incident to the war—when I say that this is no time to increase the salaries of the Members of the Congress.

I do not know whether Senators have figured up the cost of the proposed increase in the salaries of Members of Congress, but it amounts to \$2,655,000 a year. In my limited view and in the view of the people who live in my section of the country, \$2,655,000 is a considerable sum of money. When we are preaching economy and when we are face to face with the tremendous war debt and other obligations incident to the war which we must meet if we are to be faithful to those who won the war for us, I am inclined to think that this is no time to be voting salary increases for ourselves. I have been here nearly 12 years, and I have gotten along reasonably well on \$10,000 a year, plus my mileage. The fact of the matter is that I have gotten fat on the job because I have been getting so much.

Recently I have been in Mississippi trying to persuade the people of my State to let me have another term of 6 years as Senator, at \$10,000 a year. I shall be very glad to get the job at that price, and so would my four opponents.

But seriously, Mr. President—and I am serious—I think this whole bill needs study. I think we had better turn it over to the newspapers of the country and let them analyze it for the American people, because from what I have learned about the bill—I have never read it; I wish that to be understood—there are in it a number of provisions which are not exactly American. My friend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] suggested a while ago that we should prevent any man or woman from having an opportunity to be employed by any of the governmental agencies within 5 years after he or she had served on Capitol Hill as a member of the staff of some committee. Mr. President, that would be robbing a man of his individual liberty and his freedom.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. One of the most vicious practices in Washington today is that of men who have served in governmental departments resigning and entering private practice and accepting large fees as a result of the knowledge they acquired in a Government department and as a result of the officials they came to know while serving in the department.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he is a lawyer.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not.

Mr. BILBO. Perhaps that explains the Senator's position, because lawyers always charge for what they know. Perhaps the Senator would not be entitled to the increased fee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BILBO. But, Mr. President, the point I make is that this is no time to pass this bill. We should put the bill over until the first of January, and should let the people have an opportunity to understand all the implications of all the monkey business that is in the bill, which, as I understand, was written at the suggestion of approximately 40 so-called experts or economists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning with line 4 on page 81 it is proposed to strike out down through line 3 on page 84.

On page 84, line 4 it is proposed to strike out "(9)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

On page 84, in line 7, it is proposed to strike out "(10)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)."

On page 84, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Section 7 (a) of such Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the

following new sentence: "Any Member of Congress who becomes separated from the service by reason of the expiration of the term for which he was elected or appointed shall be deemed to have been involuntarily separated from the service."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of that amendment is in lieu of the more favorable provisions in the bill is to offer to any Member of Congress or to a delegate from a Territory or to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico the same opportunity to participate in the retirement benefits as is now given to civil service employees.

Before I discuss the amendment more fully, I wish to say just a few words about the pending bill. The resolution which authorized the committee to make the study which has been made was presented on January 22, 1945, and it was referred to the Rules Committee, of which I am chairman. It was reported by the Rules Committee on February 8, 1945. The original resolution was introduced by the late Senator Maloney, of Connecticut. In the interim the great Senator that he was unfortunately has passed away; and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has assumed the chairmanship of the special committee which has been instructed to make the report. The original resolution provided that the report should be made to the Rules Committee. Because of the fact that I was sympathetic with the general purpose of the proposed legislation, I urged the Rules Committee to authorize or to recommend to the Senate the appointment of a special committee, so that the entire matter could come before the Senate in the most expeditious way.

The original resolution, which was introduced on January 22, 1945, contained no reference whatever to increasing the salaries of Members of Congress, nor did it have any reference to allowing pensions or retirement benefits to Members of Congress. To that extent, I think the original resolution, as introduced by the late Senator Maloney, of Connecticut, has been overreached.

I may say, Mr. President, that with many of the matters and many of the recommendations made by the committee, I am in hearty accord. I think the time has come for a reorganization of the Senate, especially with respect to the numerous committees. I myself am a member of so many committees that it is practically impossible for me to attend and give the diligent attention which I should give to all the committee meetings which are being held.

I shall not delay the Senate, in the limited time which is allotted me, by indicating all the parts of the bill of which I approve. I especially approve, I may say, of the provision, which I trust has not been deleted, that Senators may not vote by proxy in committees. Let me ask the Senator from Wisconsin—for I have been away for several days—whether that provision still is in the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The bill now provides that the reporting of bills shall take place only when a majority membership is present in the committee, and a record vote shall be had.

Mr. BYRD. I simply wish to say, Mr. President, that I am in thorough sym-

pathy and accord with that provision of the bill.

I do not think the provision with respect to salaries should have been inserted in the bill. My feeling about salaries is this: I think there should be no larger increase in the salaries of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives than the increase which already has been given to the members of the classified service. That increase amounts to approximately 35 percent. Therefore, I would be prepared to vote for an increase of 35 percent in the salaries of Members of Congress.

Mr. President, what I have just said also applies to the retirement fund. The Members of the Congress are the ones who make the laws. Whenever the Congress of the United States votes to itself special privileges, privileges which are in excess of those of other employees of the Federal Government, I think the Congress is subjecting itself to very severe criticism. I have heard it said during the debate that democracy is on trial here, that we must make the Congress more efficient, so that it will function better. I agree with that statement. But, Mr. President, democracy is also on trial when those who serve in elective office and who have the power to vote appropriations, give to themselves benefits far in excess of those enjoyed by other employees of the Government, as they will be doing, by the pending bill, in the case of the retirement fund benefits.

Mr. President, I would not care if the difference were nominal; I would not care if it were merely a small matter. I still say in connection with matters such as retirement funds there should be no difference between the benefits granted to employees of the Civil Service and the benefits granted to Members of Congress. The Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate should use particular care and should be very diligent to see that they do not give to themselves more in any way than is given to the regular classified service employees of the Government.

Mr. President, a table has been distributed to the desk of each Senator. If Senators will refer to it they will see that by a payment of \$2,674 a Senator who entered the service on January 3, 1941, and retires on January 3, 1947, under the terms of the bill will be able to receive from the Federal Treasury \$1,465 a year as long as he lives after he reaches 62 years of age. That means, Mr. President, that if he enjoys the ordinary life expectancy for 15 years he will receive \$1,465 annually, or a total of approximately \$22,000, and for that he will have paid only \$2,674.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order that I may follow the Senator, am I to understand that the life expectancy table indicates that men who have reached 62 years of age will live, on the average, until they have reached 77?

Mr. BYRD. That is my understanding, from Civil Service Commission actuaries.

Mr. TYDINGS. That seems pretty high to me. I think the Senator is in error in his statement, but I do not have any figures available to support my belief. I know that the Senator does not wish to make an inaccurate statement.

Mr. BYRD. I have given the best information I have been able to obtain on the subject, and I may say it is based on Government statistics.

Mr. President, let us take a Government official earning \$10,000, for example, under the same conditions. He pays the same amount and receives \$822 a year after he reaches 62.

Let us go on down through the table. Take, for example, a Senator who became a Member of the Congress on January 3, 1939. He will receive \$1,892 and the civil-service employee will receive only \$1,035.

Let us take further, for example, a Senator who became a Member of the Congress on March 4, 1933. That Senator upon the payment of \$2,674 will receive at retirement, \$3,100 yearly. If he lives 15 years longer he will receive approximately \$46,000, while the civil-service employee with comparable service under similar conditions will receive only \$1,106 a year.

Let us take further, for example, a Senator who became a Member of Congress on March 4, 1925. He would be paid \$4,673 yearly when 62 years of age, and, under the same conditions, the civil-service employee would be paid \$2,322.

Those are the general differences.

Mr. President, I am not contending whatever that a pension of \$3,100 for a Senator is too high, or that \$3,500 or \$3,800 is too high. What I am endeavoring to call to the attention of the Senate is that we must not vote ourselves greater benefits and greater privileges than are to be proportionately received by the 2,000,000 other employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the Senator from Virginia familiar with the financial requirements of a man who has not been under the Civil Service Retirement Act, and who comes under it by virtue of an act of Congress, or because of other reasons? How much of the back yearly payments is he required to make up in order to get on the civil-service floor?

Mr. BYRD. He is covered in by law and does not have to pay anything in order to cover the past.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I mean. My recollection is that, in connection with many of the Government projects—I am thinking of the Aberdeen Proving Grounds and the Edgewood Arsenal, both of which are located near my home—when Congress has covered in some of the employees who have heretofore been out, those employees are not required to make up any back payment at all.

Mr. BYRD. That is very true, but the annuity of that employee is reduced by that much.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I believe that while there may be some differential involved, nevertheless, that employee takes, from the time he is covered in, exactly

what he would have taken if he had come in earlier.

Mr. BYRD. He does not receive the increased annuity. A table has been prepared which covers that situation exactly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator from Virginia put Members of Congress on the same basis with civil-service employees instead of putting them on the basis of the judiciary or officers of the Army and of the Navy?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia considers the Congress of the United States on the basis of the body which makes the laws. We, as Members of the Congress, make the laws and we should not go before the people of the country and tell them, in order to secure a few hundred dollars more a year additional for each Member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, that we have voted for ourselves a larger rate of proportionate compensation than is provided for employees of the Government who work under civil service.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator from Virginia believe that the Members of Congress should be placed in the same stratum or in the same echelon of Government service as judges, for example, are placed? If so, I may say that I do not see where there is any comparison between employees of that character and the average civil-service employee.

Mr. BYRD. I think there is a fair comparison to be made between the Members of Congress and those who fill the top jobs in the various departments and agencies of the Government. But the point I am endeavoring to make is this: I do not believe it is a good thing for the Congress of the United States to vote its Members larger benefits than are to be afforded to civil-service employees of the Government on the same basis.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the provision of the bill to which the Senator from Virginia objects should become law, would the Congress thereby be giving to its Members any greater benefits than it gives to members of the judiciary who occupy the same comparable echelon of Government service?

Mr. BYRD. I cannot say with reference to the judiciary, but if we pass this provision we will give ourselves more than Cabinet officers or heads of the various agencies of government will receive. I do not believe that we are comparable to the judiciary.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have never been sure that I was in favor of any sort of congressional retirement privileges, at least not of a financial nature. However, inasmuch as the members of the judiciary, and the high-ranking officers of the Army and of the Navy have been brought into the question, I may say that it is my understanding that none of them make any contribution to a retirement

fund. Judges who are appointed for life are not required to campaign for reelection every 2 years or every 6 years. When they have once received their appointment they serve during good behavior for the remainder of their lives, or at least until the retiring age of 70 years has been reached, at full pay. Officers of the Army and of the Navy do not retire at full pay, but when they are graduated from West Point or Annapolis and receive their appointments as officers in the Army and the Navy, they become permanently associated with those services and receive promotion from time to time as earned. They do not pay out anything for the creation of a retirement fund. Through the amendment of the Senator from Virginia he would seek to put Members of Congress on the basis of civil-service employees who have lifetime jobs.

Mr. BYRD. I cannot agree with the Senator's statement in that respect. By the action which the Senate took the other day, thousands of Government employees will be dismissed from Government service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's statement, and I may say that the Senator from Virginia is advocating the discharge of thousands more, if not millions.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. However, the theory of civil-service employment is that of life service.

Mr. BYRD. I cannot agree with that statement. Civil-service employees are retained as long as there is work for them to do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Nevertheless, those who are retained are retained permanently.

Mr. BYRD. But there is no obligation to keep them and furnish them with jobs.

Mr. BARKLEY. But if they are kept, they are kept.

Mr. BYRD. They may not be kept.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the Senator given any consideration to the question of expenses which are necessarily incurred in conducting campaigns in an effort to be reelected as Members of Congress? If the Senator has not given consideration to that subject, does he still believe that it is proper to put Members of Congress upon the same basis as those who are appointed for life, or as long as they wish to remain in Government service until the retiring age has been reached? They are not subject to removal except for cause, or because of the lack of a job. If the Government does not need them, they are dismissed, but those who are retained in the employ of the Government are not required to put themselves to any financial outlay in order to retain their positions. I wonder if the Senator has given any thought to that subject?

Mr. BYRD. I have given thought to the subject. I would be reluctant to believe that Congress should allow its Members additional expenses merely because of the necessity of meeting financial outlays in connection with political ambition. No compulsion is exercised upon a man to become a Member of the United States Senate. No one compelled me to be a candidate for the United States Sen-

ate. I became a candidate because I wanted the honor of being a United States Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as that is concerned, I do not believe that any person has ever been compelled to become a Government employee. Whoever became a Government employee became so voluntarily.

Mr. BYRD. I would not wish the Senator to connect pensions with the question of political expenses.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but the question does have something to do with a man's ability to support himself after a long tenure in public office and he finds it no longer possible to retain his office. Of course, I realize that men who are ambitious to become Members of Congress consider it to be an honor to be a Member of Congress. The Senator also knows that some of our very distinguished colleagues who have been either defeated for reelection to their positions, or have resigned, by reason of their long tenure as Senators and their experience, have been able to obtain jobs which paid them \$25,000 or \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year.

Mr. BYRD. I am not advised on that, and hope the Senator from Kentucky will not take that as applying to himself.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think if we had not departed from the Civil Service Retirement Act, all the remarks of the Senator from Virginia would be apropos, and I am not saying that they are not without great force and weight even though we have departed from it. But let me point out to the Senator that my recollection is that a judge on the Federal bench, even a circuit judge, can retire at any time for disability on three-quarters pay, that a judge in the United States judiciary can retire after a certain age at full pay, that an Army or Navy officer can retire at 60 or 62 years of age at three-quarters pay; and that none of them contributes a single cent to the retirement fund.

Mr. BYRD. Their salaries are much less than \$10,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know all about that, and their expenses are much less, too.

Mr. BYRD. A great many of their expenses are paid.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am unwilling to write the Senate off as being less worthy than the Federal judiciary, or Army and Navy officers, for the reason that it seems to me that of all the offices within the gift of the Government, the Cabinet perhaps excepted, and perhaps the Supreme Court excepted, I rank the Senate and House of Representatives right at the top.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was some discussion between the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Virginia in reference to the permanency of civil-service employment. I think that does make a difference in these comparisons.

I wonder if the Senator would not agree with me that there is a permanency in what we call permanent civil-service employment. I suspect that the

figures would show that the involuntary retirement of so-called permanent civil-service employees would probably be much less than 10 percent of the total.

Mr. BYRD. There can be no such thing as permanent civil-service employment. It is not permanent unless the Government of the United States has a job to give to a man.

Mr. President, I have only 15 minutes left. The point the Senator from Virginia is making is that this provision gives to Senators and Representatives twice as much, in proportion to the payment they make in the retirement fund, as is paid to Cabinet members and as is paid to those in every other branch of the Government except the judiciary. It may be that the judiciary, for reasons best known to Congress, was placed in a special category. Army and Navy officers are in an entirely different situation. The high officers of the Army and Navy are not paid as much as Senators receive, and their situation is entirely different.

Mr. President, I have 12 more minutes, and I presume those opposed to the amendment will probably wish to speak next. I reserve 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the joint committee and the select committee gave very careful consideration to the question of congressional retirement. I think I can say that we were not unmindful of the fact that a proposal of a retirement system for Members of the House and Senate, if it is to accomplish its objectives, must provide a sufficient amount of annuity so that Members of Congress who reach the elder-age bracket will feel that they can retire, and so that sitting Members of Congress, knowing that such a system is in operation, will be enabled to be even more independent in their actions on public questions.

I am fully aware of the situation which developed when the last action was taken in this connection, but I am convinced that the people of the United States have come to appreciate the fact that nearly every other activity in life, public or private, is now either covered by a retirement or annuity system, or soon will be. There is being made now by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives a thorough study of the proposal to broaden the social-security system so that it will include nearly all the groups which are now not covered by it. I think the people of the country recognize that nearly every important industrial concern now has a provision for the retirement of its executive personnel.

As has been pointed out, some years ago Congress extended the system of retirement to the employees of the Federal Government. We have provided retirement for members of the judiciary, whose salaries range from \$10,000 to \$22,500. They may retire, at any time after their appointment, on three-fourths of their salary, for disability, and after they have served 10 years they may retire at their full salary; and they are not required to make any contribution whatsoever to

the retirement system. The officers and enlisted personnel of the armed forces are provided with the retirement privilege, to which they do not have to make any contribution.

We believed that the congressional retirement system should be a contributory one, but we recognized, after studying the problem, that there is no analogy between the service of Members of the House and the Senate, and the employment situation of those who are in the executive arm of the Government. Under the civil-service system, employees who pass their examinations and serve their probationary period and become permanent employees, after 6 months, may stay in that system, during good behavior, if they maintain their health, until they reach retirement age. That is not the situation confronting Members of the House and Senate. They have no guaranty at all of continuity of service. Therefore, if we should apply the ironclad contributory principle to the Members of the House and Senate, the resulting annuity benefit would not accomplish any of the objectives which would be accomplished by a sound retirement system.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that civil-service employees do not go into office and remain at static salaries. Their compensation is increased from time to time during their entire service, provided they are worthy and are entitled to be promoted. They have a classification system.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They have a classification act which makes them eligible for promotion at certain stated intervals of time, and is so calculated as to bring about their promotion unless their service has been unsatisfactory.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that is not true with respect to Members of either branch of the Congress.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No. The compensation of Members of the Congress has not been increased since 1925. It is true it is proposed by this bill to increase it to \$15,000, beginning with the new Congress, if the bill should become law; but I believe I am reliably informed when I say that there have been increases in the salaries and compensation of those in the Government service since 1925 which approximates the 50 percent increase in salaries proposed in the pending measure.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am sure the distinguished Senator is correct in his last statement. In 1928 a raise was given Federal employees which was diversified. It was not a regular raise, but I think it ran from 8 to as high as 20 percent, and I believe must have averaged at least 12 percent.

As the distinguished Senator from Virginia has said, in the last two pay raises we have given Federal employees about a 35-percent increase. As a matter of fact, I think their increase since 1940,

because of in-grade increases and salary increases, has reached close to 40 percent.

So the increase here proposed would do nothing more than give to Members of the Congress about the same increase we have given to Federal employees.

If I may intrude further upon the time of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, manifestly any annuity which would be of any considerable value to Senators and Members of the House could not follow the regular annuity system applied to other Federal employees. Of course, the reason for that is very plain, namely, that Senators and Representatives average about 50 years of age when they enter on their offices, and they serve only about half the length of time other Federal employees do who are in office for any considerable period of time. Consequently, serving for comparatively short periods of time and rendering service at a rather advanced age, the regular annuity system of the Federal employees would not be of great value to them.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator uses the increases made in civil-service employment to make comparison, he should point out the fact that the heads of the bureaus have had no increases. If they are comparable to Senators, they have had no increases. When they reach the top, which is \$10,000 a year, heads of bureaus do not receive automatic increases, so they may be in the same position as Senators during this period.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I reply to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Virginia by saying that we are steadily losing from the governmental service men at the \$10,000 bracket, which is now the limit, because they can obtain substantially higher salaries in private industry. I certainly do not think that because we are unwise in doing an injustice to that particular class of public servant, we should therefore be guided in that unfortunate respect in deciding upon the retirement provision in this bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I may say also, Mr. President, that your committee considered the relationship of the recommendations which we should make with regard to the increase in compensation and the recommendations which we would make in regard to retirement. The committee was urged by some of the witnesses to recommend a very much higher salary increase than it finally recommended, and it was also urged to provide a very much more generous retirement system than it has recommended. We have endeavored, Mr. President, to be reasonable in both respects, and while maintaining the contributory principle, we have attempted in our retirement recommendations to strike a balance which will give very reasonable and modest retirement compensation, but at the same time will be sufficient to achieve the two primary objectives of a retirement system for Members of Congress. I repeat, those objectives are, first, that when they

reach the upper-age brackets they should feel that they have the opportunity to retire after years of faithful service, and, second, to give an added sense of independence to the representatives of the people in the discharge of their high responsibilities as Members of the policy-making arm of the Federal Government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it not one of the purposes of retirement systems that they be made sufficiently adequate to encourage men to retire when they reach an age when perhaps they are not quite completely physically handicapped, but when a continuation of their work involves some detriment to their efficiency? Unless the provision is made adequate and made sufficiently attractive to them there would not be the encouragement for members of the legislative body to retire when many of them probably should if they knew how they could live after they retired.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree with the Senator from Washington. I do not believe that the annuities provided for in this proposal can be attacked by anyone on the ground that they are excessive when all the considerations that surround life and service in the Congress are taken into account. Who can say that a man who has served in this body since March 4, 1913, and who makes a full back payment, should not be entitled to receive an annuity of \$7,500? Who can say that a man who has served in this body since March 4, 1913, and decides to retire, and finds himself in a position where he cannot make more than the \$2,674 back payment, and he receives an annuity of \$6,536, is receiving an amount which is excessive in relation to the service which he has rendered to his own people and to the country?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. We have a rather unique situation in the Senate in relation to the conditions we are now discussing. Men whose seniority goes back to that date have been returned many times by the people of their States to this high office, and the reason they were returned was because by their conduct here they won the confidence and the affection and the admiration of the people of their States. I have not found myself wholly in agreement on many matters with some of the more senior Members of the Senate, but the longer I have been here the better I have recognized their high ability. I know that there are distinguished Senators who in the open competitive field of the law would have been among the most distinguished lawyers this Nation has produced, and would have been capable, with a very small part of the work they have had to do and the burdens they have borne here, of earning many times the salaries which they have been content to accept as a matter of public service. They have made that sacrifice and they have made it willingly, and they do not regret it. But I would say, as a very young man in the Senate, that I feel sure the Nation would want to re-

ward by decent annuities the fine work and the high service of these men.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to say further that your committee was not unmindful of the fact, either, that it is becoming increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for men to remain in the service of the House and the Senate and of their constituencies and States in these times, especially men who do not enjoy any outside income, and who find themselves dependent on the salary that they receive. We have already seen, unfortunately, in the case of the House of Representatives, the voluntary retirement of several of its most distinguished and experienced Members who have resigned from the House, acknowledging that they were no longer able in justice to themselves and to their families to continue to serve under the compensation they receive and without any retirement benefits.

The only trouble with the amendment which the Senator from Virginia offers is that it will not accomplish the objective for which the congressional retirement system is devised. I have confidence, Mr. President, in the intelligence of the American people, and I believe that they stand ready to support the Congress in doing the courageous thing in providing a compensation which is sufficient to permit a Member of the Congress and his family to live in modest decency and comfort, to educate his children, and to discharge his family responsibilities and also in providing a retirement system which will enable those who, either because of disability or because of long service or because of the accidents of political elections, find themselves no longer Members of either the House or the Senate.

I know that it is easy to say that we are in the unfortunate position of having to pass upon our own compensation and upon our retirement system. But I say, Mr. President, that I think the time has come, if representative government in America is to be supported, when we must attract men of the highest abilities, and we must retain, insofar as the people are willing to retain them, the men who have by experience and ability become familiar with the intricate problems of government with which the Congress now has to deal.

I say very frankly that I believe the people will support us if we have the courage to meet this situation and to strengthen the personnel and the independence of the Congress of the United States.

I reserve the remainder of my time, but I shall be glad to yield it to any other Senator who wishes to oppose the pending amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I stated a while ago in a colloquy with the Senator from Virginia, whose efforts at economy we all, of course, appreciate, I have never been thoroughly sold, so far as I am personally concerned, on the retirement system for Members of Congress. That attitude may have been superinduced by my reaction to the politi-

cal implications involved in it, just as my action in voting against the salary increases may have been unconsciously influenced by the political repercussions.

I remember when I was in the House of Representatives, when the last increase in salaries occurred for Members of Congress. The salaries were increased from \$7,500 to \$10,000 a year. I voted against that salary increase. I voted against it, in part, at least, because 2 or 3 weeks before that I had voted against a general increase in the salaries of Government employees, and I was not willing to vote myself an increase when I had voted against increases for others. The newspapers in my congressional district mentioned rather favorably the fact that I had voted against that increase in salary. Some of them had editorials after this fashion: "Old BARKLEY stood by the people; he did not engage in this raid on the Treasury"; and so forth.

Congress adjourned shortly after that, and I expected to be patted on the back by everyone I saw when I got home because I had voted against the increase in the salaries of Members of Congress. I was at home for a week. I went up and down Broadway in my home city and into the stores to see my friends and visit with them. I spent an entire week there, and no one mentioned the subject. No one said a word about it. Finally an old farmer friend of mine, much older than I was, but a very dear friend who always came to town when he heard that Congress had adjourned, heard that I had returned home, and he wanted to talk about what was going on. He was a well-informed man. We stood in the shade of a brick wall for about an hour and talked about what had happened in Congress. Finally he said, "I see that you fellows in Congress increased your salaries." I replied, "Yes, Uncle Jack. They did, but I voted against it." He looked straight into my eyes for about 5 minutes, and finally he said, "You are just a damn fool." [Laughter.]

That is the only comment I ever heard in my congressional district upon the vote which I cast against increasing salaries from \$7,500 to \$10,000 a year.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to note from the Senator's remarks that he seems to have grown wiser since that day.

Mr. BARKLEY. That little conversation taught me a lesson which has been of some value to me. Frequently we underestimate the intelligence of the American people whom we represent here, and who have honored us by membership in this body.

I happen to be one of those who date back to March 4, 1913. I suppose service in the two branches is cumulative. I came to the House of Representatives on the 4th of March 1913, on the day when Woodrow Wilson was first inaugurated President of the United States. I use my own case as an example, which I think is typical. I was a young man in the practice of law. I had served as prosecuting attorney and as judge, but had not been able to save any money. I had a hard race in my first contest for the

House of Representatives. I had a growing family to educate. The result was that it was about all I could do to get by, maintaining a home in my home city and a home in Washington. A man with children must maintain a home wherever he is, and he must educate his children, wherever he is.

As I have stated, I go back to March 4, 1913. In order to draw the amount set out in this table I would be required to pay into the retirement fund \$14,747.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will pardon me, he is mistaken. If he will look at the other columns he will find that if he retires on January 1, 1947, he may pay \$2,674 and receive an annual pension of \$6,538.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the 5-year repayment.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator retires on January 1, 1947, he may pay in \$2,674 and receive an annual pension of \$6,538. This table was prepared by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me see. I do not wish to be mistaken. Column 2 is headed "Amount owed as of January 2, 1947." Coming down to March 4, 1913, the figure is \$14,747.

Mr. BYRD. That is an option which the Senator would have, but he would not be compelled to exercise that option.

Mr. BARKLEY. In order to receive \$7,500 a year, which is three-fourths of the present salary, I would have to pay in \$14,747.

Mr. BYRD. But—

Mr. BARKLEY. However, I might choose to pay in for only 5 years.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator should choose that plan, if he were to retire on January 1, 1947, he would pay in \$2,674 and would receive \$6,538 a year for as long as he lived. I pray that he will live for many years to come, and will not retire.

Mr. BARKLEY. I join in that prayer. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. The Senator would draw \$6,538 a year, but the head of an agency who receives \$10,000 a year and pays in the same amount would receive only \$3,859.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was taking the sheet column by column.

Mr. BYRD. The first column is somewhat confusing, because it represents an option which gives slightly more.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will read the heading, he will see that all he has to pay is \$2,674, for the last 5 years of service, and he receives \$6,538 a year.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand, but I have not yet come to the 5-year option.

Mr. BYRD. I was afraid the Senator would not get to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. However, if I wished to receive retirement income of \$7,500 a year, I would have to pay into the fund \$14,747, or practically \$15,000. There is an option under which I could pay only for the last 5 years of service—and under this system if one does not pay at least that much into the fund he does not receive any retirement benefits. I sup-

pose most of us would pay back \$2,674 instead of \$14,747, for obvious reasons. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I realize that service in this body and in the House of Representatives constitutes a great honor. The men who sit here help to make history, and sometimes they make important history. There is nothing derogatory about the ambition of a man to serve in the Senate or the House of Representatives for a long time. When I was a young student in college and read about Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, I thought that I would rather serve in the United States Senate and attain the reputation that they enjoyed—if I could—than to be any President of the United States who was ever elected. I still believe that. I believe that to be a long-time Member of this body and render distinguished service is an honor not to be excelled by that of any other position to which the American people could elevate one of their fellow citizens.

To me it has always seemed abhorrent that those of us who are not rich should hang on to membership in this body merely for the sake of having a job. Of course we cannot afford to have a Senate composed exclusively of rich men. The same observation applies to the House of Representatives. To me it has always been abhorrent and tragic for a man to serve here with distinction and arrive at an elderly state in life when he looks upon membership in the United States Senate as a mere job, something to be held on to because he does not have sufficient means to support himself and has not been able to lay aside enough to support himself after he retires from long service in this body or in the House of Representatives. Before I would permit myself to reach the age where I was merely hanging on to my seat in the Senate because it was a job which provided me a living, rather than the greater obligation and the greater concept of duty, I would retire tomorrow, at an age when I might still be able to make money and indulge in profitable activities, and in a comparatively short time lay aside something for a rainy day.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of these reflections of mine, I shall vote for the provisions of the bill to increase the salaries of Members of the two Houses to \$15,000 a year. I am satisfied that if my old friend were yet living—which I regret to say he is not—instead of commenting upon my vote as he did 21 years ago, if he could meet me in my home town after the adjournment of Congress and we could stand on the shady side of a wall and talk about what had happened, he would approve my vote this time. If any one in my district disapproved it, I would probably never hear about it.

Mr. President, I believe that membership in this body or in the other body of Congress is of equal dignity with that of the judiciary. After 10 years' service Federal judges are retired at full pay, without having to contribute a nickel. I would not want them to do so. I would not vote to require them to do so. Judges who give up their practice and go on the bench and serve for 10 years

can retire at full pay. I am not willing to say that our service here is of a dignity and importance less than that of judges; and I am not willing to say that our service here is of a dignity and importance less than that of Army and Navy officers, who can retire at the age of 64. None of them has ever been required to contribute a single dime to the fund out of which they receive their retirement pay.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it is a matter of regret to me that I find myself in total disagreement with the Senator from Virginia with respect to this amendment. I believe that it is sound in practice and wise in principle to write a retirement law of this sort. I do not know how it will work in individual cases. No one would ever suspect, looking at the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and then looking at me, that I am also among the group who would have to pay the sum of almost \$15,000 to obtain the benefits of retirement. When I saw those figures I stepped across the aisle and said to the Senator from Kentucky, "How am I going to take advantage of this unless you will lend me the \$15,000?" The Senator from Kentucky replied that he would gladly do so if I would tell him where he could get it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator should make it clear that he could pay in \$2,674 and receive \$6,538 a year.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator ought to state both propositions. Why there is such an alternative in the bill I do not know.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that. I shall speak of it in a moment if I do not talk too long about other things.

Mr. President, I believe in the principle of retirement. We have extended it to the entire Federal judiciary of the United States. Members of the Supreme Court and of district courts throughout the entire length and breadth of the country are the beneficiaries of a retirement system. The officers of our Army and Navy have the benefit of retirement laws. Many of our Federal civil employees have the benefit of retirement laws. Modern, liberal, and forward-looking industries have been putting into effect, and I venture to say will continue to put into effect, retirement systems for their employees.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for moment?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that judges who have been retired are subject to being called back to duty, and officers of the Army and the Navy who have retired are subject to being called back to duty. But Members of Congress are not subject to being called back, unless they are reelected.

Mr. WHITE. I admit that that is true. I merely say that they are the beneficiaries of retirement systems, and I stop with that statement.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Would not the Senator agree that all Members of Congress who are defeated would be delighted to be called back to the service? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE. Well, it may be that I shall give the people of Maine a chance to call me back to service, but with no intervening defeat. But, Mr. President, I wish to say that I am in favor of the bill because of its basic and fundamental principles. I am in favor of the retirement system which it proposes, for, as I have said, retirement systems are provided for Government employees who are under the civil-service system, for officers of the Army and the Navy, and retirement systems are provided for the employees of practically all forward-looking industrial concerns in our land.

Some fear and some criticism have been expressed because of the provision that the Members of Congress vote themselves the proposed retirement benefits. However, if we do not do so, who will? The Members of the House and the Members of the Senate have always faced the responsibility of fixing their own salaries, because under our constitutional system no one else can do so. The Members of Congress have always provided, in their judgment, for their clerical assistants and they have always provided for their railroad mileage and their stationery allowances. All that we have done because under our constitutional system no one else can do it. That burden was placed on the Members of Congress by the Constitution of the United States, and we who are the present Members of Congress are charged with the duty of fixing our own salaries and allowances.

As the Senator from Kentucky has said, he and I have voted to reduce salaries and allowances, and there is no difference in principle between doing that and voting now to increase these salaries and benefits.

The Senator from Virginia has voiced the criticism that under the proposed system the Members of the Congress would enjoy larger retirement benefits than those which many of the civil-service employees enjoy. That is true. But it is also true that we who are Members of Congress provide larger salaries for ourselves than we do for various of the civil-service employees. If the logic of what the Senator from Virginia has said were to be applied all the way through, we should either increase the pay of all civil-service employees to the level of the pay we receive, or we should reduce our pay to the amount of theirs. However, no one seriously makes such a contention.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I simply wish to make it clear that the comparisons made on the chart which I have presented are based on salaries of \$10,000 a year for civil-service employees.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I have said, I believe in the principle of retirement, and I hope the Byrd amendment will be defeated. I hope the bill will be

passed with the provision for the retirement benefits, and I hope I shall be able to negotiate some sort of arrangement with the Senator from Kentucky under which I may enjoy the most-favored benefits of the provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may be given a minute, I should like to say that I might make an arrangement like the one which is often mentioned as having been made between Henry Clay and Daniel Webster. There is a very old story, which is told here in Washington, that Henry Clay went downtown to a bank, to borrow \$500. The requirement of the bank was that he must have someone sign the note with him. So he took the blank note which he had to sign and went out to get another signature. He met Webster, and said to him, "Mr. Webster, I want to borrow \$500 at the bank, and they require another signature. Will you go on the note with me?" Webster is said to have replied, "Yes. But I need \$500 myself. Let us make it \$1,000."

So the two of them signed it, and each got \$500 apiece for the joint note which they had signed jointly.

So, Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine can negotiate some such arrangement in Washington, I will sign his note if he will sign mine. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall not take that much time. I should like to call attention to the fact that if one were to make payments to the retirement fund for the 5 years required under the provisions of the bill, and also thereafter were to pay 6 percent of his annual salary, he would, if he were in the situation in which I find myself, for instance, pay in \$2,674 and then, in my case, if I should be fortunate enough to live out the period of my present term—4 years from now—would pay, at the same rate, approximately \$2,400 more, and on the basis of the proposed increased salary approximately \$3,600 more. The annuity which I would be entitled to receive at that time would be in the neighborhood of \$4,700.

Mr. President, it would rarely occur that a man who spent his life in this body, until he reached 70 years of age, would live long enough thereafter to draw many annuity payments. He would be very fortunate indeed if he lived to receive back the amount of money he paid in, plus his actual contributions on the basis required by this bill. Indeed, it would be more or less of a gamble if one were required to pay in \$2,674, plus 6 percent upon, let us say, \$15,000, assuming that the salary will be raised to that amount—or \$900 a year—with the possibility of getting back only approximately \$4,700, if he did not have the assurance that whatever payments he actually made would be returned to him, in any and in all events—which is true under the provisions of the bill; and it is also true that one who retired under the proposed retirement system could elect to have his wife or his dependents receive a portion of his annuity, but in that event the amount he would receive would be reduced substantially.

So when one considers that after a long period of service in this body, after a man has reached the age of 65 or 70 years he has only a fair opportunity to receive an annuity equal to the amount of his actual contributions, it is obvious that we shall not be over-generous with ourselves if we set up the proposed retirement system.

Furthermore, I should like to say that, from long experience in public life—and I have been in public life since 1906—I believe it does not matter very much what salary a man receives, because if that is all the income a Member of Congress has, all of it will be spent in connection with his office or in getting re-elected to his office. In other words, the salary is not of great consequence.

I would far prefer to receive the retirement benefits provided by this bill, meager as they are, than to have a greatly increased salary, although at my time of life it probably would be better to have a sharp increase in salary. But I know that all moneys honestly received for services actually rendered in public office are consumed or absorbed in the discharge of one's duties and in the meeting of his obligations in public office. His only possible recompense, if he is a man of very limited income or if he is a poor man, is to be able to feel that he has some meager retirement benefits which he may claim at the end of his service.

I have no hesitancy in saying, Mr. President, that under this bill there would be no great inducement to me to pay in \$2,674 and 6 percent annually henceforth on my salary, in return for the possibility of drawing the retirement amount which I might be able to receive if I were to retire at the end of my present term.

At the same time, I have always felt, ever since I entered service in this body, that the surest way to obtain public servants of the right character and the right quality was to give them some assurance of receiving retirement benefits at the time when their services end.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote into law the retirement provision provided by this bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall make a very brief statement, and then I shall turn over the balance of the time to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

I should like to say, in answer to the statement of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], that under the provisions of this bill it will not be necessary to pay the \$2,674 now and then pay 6 percent on the salary thereafter. The option to come under the retirement system can be exercised at any time within 6 months after any Member of the Congress takes his oath.

Mr. GEORGE. Is the Senator from Virginia willing to guarantee that I shall be living 6 months from now, or at the end of my term?

Mr. BYRD. I think I would.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the Senator's guaranty would be good, but I would not take a chance on it. If this bill passed, I would immediately take the benefit of the retirement and I would pay in my

money, the \$2,674, and would pay the 6 percent thereafter.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to say one other word. Comparison has been made here between the retirement proposed for Members of Congress and the retirement provided for judges and for officers of the Army and the Navy. I submit that such a comparison cannot properly be made, because a judge can be called back to public service and, likewise, retired officers of the Army and Navy can be called back for subsequent service.

Mr. President, I wish to give only two examples of how this proposal would affect those in executive agencies receiving \$10,000 a year. The table which I now hold, and which I will later ask to be printed in the RECORD, has been prepared on the basis of an annual salary of \$10,000 for Members of Congress and for the heads of various governmental agencies.

If a Member of Congress who was elected in 1933 retires on January 1, 1947, he will have paid \$2,674, and will receive \$3,100. If his life expectancy is 15 years longer, he will receive \$46,000.

An official of the Government, drawing \$10,000 a year, who has paid \$2,674 will receive \$1,606, and if his life expectancy at age 62 is 15 years longer, he will receive during that time \$21,000.

If a Member of Congress were elected in 1933 and retires on January 1, 1947, and has paid in \$2,674, he will receive \$4,975, which, on the basis of 15 more years of life expectancy, will result in his drawing \$75,000. The head of an agency who is receiving \$10,000 a year will, on the same basis, receive only \$37,500.

The objection to this provision is that it makes a difference between Members of Congress who appropriate the money and control the purse strings and the heads of the various agencies. I do not believe this should be. If any good reason could be advanced for doing it, then the money should be paid out of a special fund. The money should not be paid out of a fund which has been contributed to by the civil-service employees and by the Government. Seventy percent of the civil-service retirement fund is contributed by the Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter from the United States Civil Service Commission dated June 5, 1946, which confirms the statements which I have made. Included with the letter is the table which we have been discussing.

There being no objection, the letter and the table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1946.

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Reference is made to your recent telephone request that the Commission submit an analysis of that portion of Senate bill 2177 relating to retirement pay for Members of Congress.

Subsection (a) of section 602 of the bill amends section 3 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to include Members of Congress within the

terms of the Civil Service Retirement Act. The amendment would apply to Senators and Representatives of Congress and Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii and Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. The exclusion of the President and Vice President as now contained in the Retirement Act would be continued.

Subsection (b) of section 602 adds a new section 3A to the Retirement Act. This section outlines the benefits which would be provided in the case of Members of Congress differing from those applicable to other members of the system.

Members of the Congress would be permitted to exercise an option to become members of the system. This option must be exercised at any time within 6 months after the date of enactment of this bill, or at any time within 6 months after last taking the oath of office as a Member of Congress. Thus, a Member could not wait until he was out of office and then elect to come under the act, nor would the act apply to former Members of Congress. Any former Member, however, who may later again become a Member of Congress will, of course, have the opportunity at that time to elect to come within the purview of the retirement law.

Members of Congress who elect to become subject to the provisions of the act would be required to contribute to the retirement fund at the rate of 6 percent of their base pay from the date of such election rather than 5 percent as is the case of other persons subject to the retirement law. Deposit for any service as a Member of Congress subsequent to the date of enactment would be required at the rate of 6 percent of base pay. Deposit for the purpose of purchasing credit for past service performed prior to the date of enactment could be made at the same rate as in the case of other persons subject to the civil-service retirement law; that is, 2½ percent for service from August 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926, 3½ percent from July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942, and 5 percent from July 1, 1942. No deposit would be required for service rendered prior to August 1, 1920.

All contributions and deposits for service as a Member of Congress would be credited to the individual account of the Member, and if the service of the Member should terminate for any reason before eligibility for annuity attached, his contributions would be refunded with interest thereon at the rate of 4 percent compounded annually. Unless the Member of Congress was retired for disability, in which case it would be necessary that he serve a minimum of 5 years, he would not be eligible for annuity benefits unless he has completed at least 6 years of service as a Member of Congress and makes deposit for at least 5 years of his congressional service.

The annuity of a Member of Congress would, if he contributed or made deposit for all of his congressional service subsequent to July 31, 1920, be in an amount equal to 2½ percent of the average annual pay he received as a Member of Congress, multiplied by his years of service as a Member of Congress but limited to three-fourths of his average annual pay. If a Member of Congress fails to contribute or make deposit for all his years of congressional service, the years for which he did not contribute or make deposit would be included in computing his annuity, but the annuity would be reduced by an amount equal to the amount of annuity which his contributions or deposit, including interest thereon, would purchase if made.

If a Member of Congress is 62 years of age or over when he leaves office, his annuity would become payable on the first day of the month following the month in which he separates. If, however, he leaves office prior to attaining the age of 62, his annuity would not commence until the first day of the month following the month in which he attains age 62.

A Member of Congress would be privileged to elect any of the types of annuity provided for by the retirement law; that is, life annuity with return of the unexpended balance, forfeiture annuity, or a joint and survivorship annuity.

In case any Member of Congress has received a refund of contributions made by him as such Member and he later has additional service which qualifies him for annuity, he must redeposit the amount refunded to him with interest in order to receive such annuity.

Under the Retirement Act, at present, service as a Member of Congress is creditable for annuity purposes in cases where the annuitant had other subsequent governmental service which was within the purview of the act. This would be changed under the amendment so that in any case in which a person can qualify for a congressional annuity (i. e., if he has 6 years of service as a Member of Congress, any of which occurs after the date of enactment of the amendment), his service as a Member of Congress cannot be credited for the purposes of a regular annuity under the act. If, however, he has less than 6 years of service as a Member of Congress, or if all of his congressional service was performed prior to the enactment of the amendment, such service can be credited for the purposes of a regular annuity provided he has other Government service bringing him under the act. In no case can service other than service as a Member of Congress be considered in computing a congressional annuity under the amendment. There may be instances, of course, where a person has six or more years of service as a Member of Congress, thus qualifying him for an annuity under the amendment, and also has five or more years of other governmental service performed either prior to or after his congressional service, also qualifying him for an annuity under other provisions of the act. In such a case the annuity payable would be equal to the aggregate of the two annuities separately computed. It should be emphasized, however, that period of service credited for the purposes of the one computation may in no event be credited for the purposes of the other computation.

In case a Member of Congress is retired and receives an annuity, but is thereafter again elected to Congress, his annuity would be suspended during the period he holds office. He may then again elect to become a member of the system, in which event he would be required to contribute 6 percent of his basic salary, and his annuity would be recomputed with the inclusion of the additional service upon subsequent separation. If, however, he does not elect to again become a member of the system and have deductions made for this subsequent period of service, the annuity upon his separation will be resumed in the same amount, and there will be no recomputation of the annuity to allow credit for the subsequent service.

Under the present retirement system, retirement is compulsory upon attaining age 70 after completion of 15 years' service. An employee may retire at his option after attaining the age of 60 and completion of 30 years of service, or attaining the age of 62 and rendering 15 years' service. These provisions for automatic separation and optional retirement would not apply to Members of Congress.

There is inclosed herewith chart showing the annuities payable under S. 2177 and the Civil Service Retirement Act to members of Congress should their services be terminated January 2, 1947.

If further information on this subject is desired, the Commission will be pleased to furnish same upon your request.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

Annuities payable under S. 2177 and the Civil Service Retirement Act to Members of Congress whose services are terminated Jan-

uary 2, 1947, according to indicated entry date into service and whether full contributions for all prior service or only contribu-

tions for the last 5 years of service (\$2,674) have been made. In the latter case the annuity shown is for indicated select ages:

Date of entry into service	Amount owed as of Jan. 2, 1947	Annuity payable if contributions are made for all prior service		Annuity payable at indicated ages if contributions are made only for the last 5 years of service (\$2,674) ¹							
		S. 2177	Civil Service Retirement Act	62		65		70		75	
				S. 2177	Civil Service Retirement Act	S. 2177	Civil Service Retirement Act	S. 2177	Civil Service Retirement Act	S. 2177	Civil Service Retirement Act
Jan. 3, 1941	\$3,108	\$1,500	\$857	\$1,465	\$822	\$1,463	\$820	\$1,458	\$815	\$1,451	\$808
Jan. 3, 1939	4,030	2,000	1,143	1,892	1,035	1,884	1,027	1,868	1,011	1,846	989
Jan. 3, 1937	5,026	2,500	1,429	2,313	1,242	2,299	1,228	2,271	1,200	2,133	1,162
Jan. 3, 1935	6,105	3,000	1,714	2,727	1,441	2,707	1,421	2,666	1,380	2,611	1,325
Mar. 4, 1933	7,168	3,458	1,964	3,100	1,606	3,074	1,580	3,020	1,526	2,949	1,455
Mar. 4, 1931	8,421	3,958	2,250	3,500	1,792	3,467	1,759	3,398	1,690	3,307	1,599
Mar. 4, 1929	9,777	4,458	2,536	3,892	1,970	3,851	1,929	3,766	1,844	3,653	1,731
Mar. 4, 1927	11,243	4,958	2,821	4,275	2,138	4,226	2,089	4,123	1,986	3,987	1,850
Mar. 4, 1925	12,525	5,458	3,107	4,673	2,322	4,616	2,265	4,498	2,147	4,341	1,990
Mar. 4, 1923	13,444	5,833	3,393	4,975	2,535	4,913	2,473	4,783	2,343	4,612	2,172
Mar. 4, 1921	14,438	6,208	3,679	5,271	2,742	5,203	2,674	5,061	2,532	4,875	2,346
Mar. 4, 1919	14,747	6,583	3,964	5,621	3,002	5,551	2,932	5,406	2,787	5,215	2,595
Mar. 4, 1917	14,747	6,958	4,250	5,996	3,288	5,926	3,218	5,781	3,073	5,590	2,882
Mar. 4, 1915	14,747	7,333	4,536	6,371	3,574	6,301	3,504	6,156	3,359	5,955	3,168
Mar. 4, 1913	14,747	7,500	4,821	6,538	3,859	6,468	3,789	6,323	3,644	6,132	3,453

¹ The paradoxical situation of employees receiving less at the older ages where full contributions have not been made for all service rendered after July 1920 is due to the fact that the full annuity is reduced by the annuity equivalent to the amount of indebtedness to the fund, which increases with age.

NOTE.—As Members of Congress receive a constant salary their contributions in relation to salary—and, therefore, annuity—would be in general appreciably higher than for other employees. This point should be understood in comparing S. 2177 with the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I feel that I must support the Byrd amendment for several reasons. In the first place, I am a member of the Civil Service Committee of the Senate and served through two lengthy and trying considerations of the task of adjusting pay schedules of Federal employees. During those two considerations we were confronted with many problems, not the least of which was the tremendous responsibility which descended upon this sovereign body of fixing in equity and fairness, without hope of recourse on their part, the salaries of subordinate officials. Such a responsibility was not an easy one to discharge.

In the first place, the overriding interest was that of the public at large. In fixing salaries of Government employees, care must be exercised or pressure groups, some of which are hostile during times of emotion and economic chaos, will lead the Congress to invade the public interest by allowing salaries of public employees and officials to become too great.

On the other hand, the responsibility of the Members of the Congress, from whom there is no appeal, demands that they shall be as equitable and fair in their treatment of subordinate employees as their duty to the public will permit. I do not say that we have done a perfect job in that regard, but I do assert that in some instances we have reduced the scale of increases in the salaries of public employees to such an extent that those employees may justifiably feel that they have been unfairly treated.

Perhaps in other instances we granted increases in salaries which were more than commensurate with the duties to be performed.

Mr. President, while I am not satisfied with many of the provisions of this bill, yet I expect to support it in its finality because it is a step in a most needed approach toward a reorganization of the administration of the National Congress.

I once said, before I had been a Member of the Senate 2 or 3 years, and had begun to think that I had acquired sufficient seniority to give me the privilege

of suggesting such a thing, that I hoped sometime to have a chance to vote on a measure to reorganize the machinery of the Congress.

Mr. President, I feel that in this reorganization bill the question of retirement should not have been approached. I also believe that the question of congressional salaries should not have been approached in a bill dealing with the reorganization of the mechanics of the Congress.

The way I feel about the proposed retirement provision is this: In the first place, I believe that the dignity and responsibility of the Congress of the United States are fully equivalent to that of the Federal courts, and equal to that of the Army and of the Navy. But the pending bill does not approach the retirement benefits of those accorded members of those departments. I would say that if an equitable retirement bill were being considered, it should be considered on the basis of the equality of the superior or paramount branches of the Government. But the pending bill does not approach the subject on that basis. It is neither fish, flesh, nor fowl. It is half way between the retirement of the regular civil-service employees, who are career people, and those who, as a part of the rewards of their position, accept their employment with retirement benefits already stipulated.

I believe, therefore, that if we are going to approach the situation as a collateral matter to the reorganization of the mechanics of the Congress, we should first begin on the basis of civil-service retirement benefits, and if they are found to be good and proper, and at some later time it be the will of the Congress, we can alter or readjust the retirement benefits for Members of Congress who have given long and satisfactory service to their country.

Mr. President, there is a difference between service in the national legislative body and service in any elective office in a city or county; at least, I hope there is such a difference. If there is not, I have a misconception of the ideals of

public service. I assert that no Member of this body, or any other elected official of the United States was required to seek the office which he holds. I have seen many advertisements in the newspapers which read something like this: "Having been urged by my friends to run for the office * * *" I have yet to see the man who, as a candidate for a substantial office, had to be urged very strongly by his friends to become a candidate for that office. Perhaps some of his friends said to him, "Charlie, we think you ought to run for this office," but early in the spring when the flies begin to come out of their winter hiding places, fish snap very fast when the bait is tossed to them. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not make that statement in any way disparaging to the magnificent public service which has been rendered to our country during the past 150 years in the States, and in the national legislative body. But that service, Mr. President, was rendered in the main, I believe, first, by persons who had a bent for public affairs, and secondly, by those who had a desire to render public service, knowing that such service had to be compensated for to a large degree by the satisfaction they would receive in trying as best they could to present their views and those of the people whom they represented.

Mr. President, I agree that the salary which is paid a Member of the United States Congress is not too great when one considers the expenses attached to the office. I knew what the expenses were when I came to Washington as a Member of the Senate. I lived in the State of Iowa where it did not cost as much to live as it does in the city of Washington. I was told what my salary as a United States Senator would be, and what it would cost me to live in the city of Washington. I am much like the fellow who went to a judge and said he wanted to obtain a divorce from his wife. The judge said, "Why, Henry, didn't you take this woman for better or for worse?" The man replied, "Yes, Judge, but she was a lot worse than I took her for."

[Laughter.] I believe that the average man who becomes a Member of the Senate finds that situation to obtain so far as the expenses of his office are concerned. But that is beside the point.

Mr. President, Members of Congress do have a grave responsibility. We are a sovereign body. We have an unappealable control over the subordinate officials of the Government in respect to their compensation. We therefore acquire a tremendous responsibility in connection with fixing the compensation which the employees of the Government shall receive. In fixing our own emoluments, and in prescribing the benefits which may be associated with our office, we must be careful not to go beyond the bounds of propriety, fairness, and equity. In exercising our judgment in regard to that subject, we may sometimes lean over backward and deny ourselves some of the emoluments which perhaps we should have, but it would be better to do that than to do something which would result in our being accused of using the power of our office to provide for ourselves benefits which would be greater than those received by others over whom we have control and dominion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 5 o'clock has arrived.

Mr. BYRD. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Hawkes	Murray
Austin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Bilbo	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Huffman	Radcliffe
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bushfield	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capehart	La Follette	Stanfill
Capper	Lucas	Stewart
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McKellar	Tunnell
Downey	McMahon	Tydings
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
George	Maybank	Wagner
Guffey	Millikin	Walsh
Gurney	Moore	Wherry
Hart	Morse	White
Hatch	Murdoch	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE] and the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] and Mr. TAYLOR are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Bermuda.

I also announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda. If present the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who is absent by leave of the Senate, has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is necessarily detained. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS 22		
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Knowland	Stanfill
Capehart	McClellan	Stewart
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Hickenlooper	Moore	
Huffman	O'Daniel	

NAYS—43		
Andrews	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hawkes	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarran	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Tydings
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
George	Maybank	Wherry
Guffey	Morse	White
Gurney	Murdoch	
Hart	Murray	

NOT VOTING—31		
Alken	Brewster	Butler
Bailey	Briggs	Carville
Bankhead	Buck	Chavez

Ellender	Mead	Tobey
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wheeler
Fulbright	Myers	Wiley
Gerry	Revercomb	Willis
Gossett	Shipstead	Wilson
Green	Smith	Young
Langer	Taylor	
McFarland	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. BYRD's amendment was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 79, beginning in line 18, it is proposed to strike out through line 2, on page 80.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 80, line 10, after the word "repeal", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request, which I ask to have read and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized and directed to make all necessary clerical and technical changes, including changes in section numbers and cross references, in the engrossed bill (S. 2177) to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the request is granted.

If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have several letters from departments of the Government relating to the bill which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement it seems to the Chair that the request is out of order. The letters may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MURRAY. I ask that the letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1946.
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: In response to your letter of June 3, I am glad to submit additional comments, in view of subsequent amendments, on sections 130 and 208 of S. 2177, which provides for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government. You ask particularly whether

these provisions would have the effect of preventing flexible fiscal policy on the part of both the Congress and the Executive.

So far as section 130 is concerned, it seems entirely proper for the Congress in the spring of each year to state the sense of the Congress in respect to total Federal expenditures, revenues, and deficits.

Section 208, however, would seriously hamper the development of a flexible fiscal policy on the part of the Federal Government.

In face of changed conditions, it would give the President a mandate to reduce expenditures in place of requiring him to submit recommendations for congressional consideration on expenditures, revenues, debt, and other proposed legislation.

Sections 130 and 208 taken together would seem to cause automatic adjustments in Federal expenditures that might well produce unfavorable, rather than favorable, effects. Such a procedure, even if the President is granted more latitude in assigning the reductions, may still cripple economically and socially programs planned and under way on the basis of congressional appropriations. It must be assumed that such expenditures are desirable and needed or they would not have been authorized by the Congress originally. This subsequent reduction would likely aggravate any business decline still further. In such a case, at the very moment the President and joint committee under the Employment Act of 1946 are requesting Congress to undertake means to compensate for a business decline and mounting unemployment, the President, on the other hand, would be forced to devise a means of reducing appropriations which might be contrary to the recommendations he would make under the Employment Act.

If strictly adhered to, it would tend to nullify the very constructive provisions of the Employment Act of 1946. This act requires that the President and Joint Committee on the Economic Report constantly review current economic conditions and recommend all "practicable means" for preventing unemployment. One of these widely recognized means is flexible fiscal policy—the increasing or decreasing of expenditures and revenues by the Congress as conditions and economic needs change and without waiting for a new fiscal year or until conditions become so depressed that the President feels compelled to declare a state of national emergency.

A legal issue also arises which deserves attention. If under section 208 the President is required to cut during the latter half of a fiscal year the appropriations approved subsequent to the concurrent resolution, he must then act on the basis of a congressional resolution without having had an opportunity to exercise his constitutional power of veto.

If the obligation upon the President to cut expenditures should remain in the legislation, then the concurrent resolution should be changed into a joint resolution.

I hope you will call upon me at any time that I can be of further service.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. APPELBY,
Acting Director.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION
AND RECONVERSION,

Washington, D. C., June 10, 1946.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: You have requested my views on sections 130 and 208 of the legislative reorganization bill, S. 2177. In my opinion, these sections raise grave questions warranting the most careful consideration.

These sections represent a new method of developing and enacting executive appropriations for each fiscal year, and under certain conditions, for reducing these appropriations

in the middle of the year. The procedure proposed is a drastic departure from existing techniques. In this letter I would like to outline two of the problems raised by these provisions.

Section 130 provides that the revenue (Senate Finance, House Ways and Means) and Appropriations Committees of both Houses shall meet jointly early in the calendar year to prepare an estimate of total Federal receipts and expenditures for the next fiscal year. In discharging this function these committees will largely overlap the work of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report established by the Employment Act of 1946. Not only will the functions overlap, but both groups will be engaged in examining the same subject matter at approximately the same time.

Section 208, or any similar provision which operates to reduce appropriations in the middle of the fiscal year, will seriously interfere with the orderly operations of the executive agencies. I would also anticipate that such a provision would directly result in inefficiency because of the inability of executive agencies to plan their expenditures for the full fiscal year.

No executive agency has been afforded an opportunity to be heard on these provisions of the reorganization bill. Because of the importance of these provisions to the operations of the executive branch, I believe it essential that an opportunity be afforded the various agencies to give specific illustrations of how such a provision would affect their operations, their efficiency, and their personnel.

For these reasons I am of the opinion that the enactment of these provisions without further study would be undesirable.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER,
Director.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
June 10, 1946.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Reference is made to your request of June 4, 1946, for an expression of our views on sections 130 and 208 of S. 2177, a bill to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government.

Section 130 of the bill provides that by joint action the Revenue and Appropriation Committees of both Houses shall report to the Congress the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year, such report to be made within 60 days after the opening of each regular session or by April 15, whichever occurs first. If the report indicates that estimated expenditures exceed estimated receipts, Congress would authorize an increase in the public debts by the amount of such excess, before considering the general appropriation bills for the ensuing fiscal year. This section would not be applicable in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President.

Section 208 provides that if on December 31 in any fiscal year the President is of the opinion that the excess of expenditures over receipts will be in an amount greater than that authorized by the Congress pursuant to section 130, he shall reduce all appropriations, with certain exceptions, by a uniform percentage in an aggregate amount sufficient to reduce such excess to the amount of the excess approved by the Congress. The provisions of this section would not apply in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President.

Section 130 apparently has the objective of an over-all coordination of the revenue and appropriation processes of the Government. With this objective we are in complete agreement. It is felt, however, that the provisions of sections 130 and 208 raise some rather fundamental questions.

These sections would require the administration of certain phases of the budget and fiscal affairs of the Government by rule rather than by any criteria of necessity. Under section 208 the major consideration appears to be to balance the amount of the difference of expenditures and receipts against a predetermined amount fixed by concurrent resolution of Congress months before the needs become evident and before the amount of receipts can be determined. For example, the Employment Act of 1946 provides for not only annual reports to be submitted during the beginning of each year, but also interim reports to be submitted later in the year which may indicate substantial changes in the employment situation and the need for Government action in the public interest. The large extent to which the employment situation can change within a period of only a few months was definitely indicated by the experience which the country had in 1937 when the index of industrial production went down from 116 in January to 87 in December. Thus the Government had to take action during the last few months of the year to alleviate economic distress which could not have been anticipated accurately during the first few weeks of the year. The bill in its present form does not appear to provide sufficient flexibility for the recognition of such a situation.

The Employment Act of 1946 (Pub. Law 304, 79th Cong.), provides that the President shall submit to Congress within 60 days after the beginning of each regular session an economic report and that the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report shall submit its comments thereon not later than May 1 of each year. S. 2177, however, requires that the revenue and appropriation committees shall submit and report on the over-all estimates of appropriations and receipts not later than 60 days after the beginning of each regular session, or on April 15. This would mean that the joint committee, in making their study, would not have the benefit of the recommendations of the joint committee on the economic report and that, therefore, the objectives of the Employment Act might be nullified to some extent unless the concurrent resolution as provided for in section 130 (a) should be subsequently revised, if necessary, to give effect to the recommendations of the joint committee on the economic report. Moreover, if sufficient time is allowed for the studies provided for in this bill and the Employment Act, it is doubtful whether enough time would remain for the appropriation bills to be considered adequately and acted upon before the beginning of the ensuing fiscal year.

The provisions of section 208 of the bill, for the reduction of appropriations on December 31, after one-half of the fiscal year has expired, could present some very difficult problems in planning work programs, budgetary control, etc. For instance, appropriation acts provide for the accomplishment of certain projects or programs which are undertaken shortly after July 1 only after considerable planning. The elimination or curtailment of such programs midway in the fiscal year would not only prevent the completion of work contemplated by the Congress in the appropriation acts, but in many instances would result in the expenditure of time and money without commensurate benefits to the Government. It is apparent that in operation one-half of the year's program would be forced to bear the entire burden of the reduction.

In this connection, it should be noted that many of the programs administered by this Department do not progress at a uniform rate throughout the year, but fluctuate with crop-growing seasons and weather conditions.

Moreover, the reduction of appropriations by a uniform percentage would fail to recognize the necessity for essential and urgently

needed appropriations, such as those for the protection of public health, public safety, and public property, for the continuance of the national policy on employment, for the control or eradication of crop or livestock pests and diseases, and for other essential activities as well as emergency and unforeseeable needs. It is conceivable that exceptions to section 208 of the bill might be made in the case of certain appropriations, thus resulting in a disproportionate reduction in those appropriations to which such exceptions did not apply. In addition, to the extent that supplemental or deficiency appropriations may be made subsequently for urgent and unforeseeable situations, the appropriations made in the annual appropriation bills might necessarily be reduced. It would seem that a more constructive method for the reduction of expenditures, when necessary, would be accomplished after a thorough review and analysis, through the regular appropriation processes, of the relative needs and purposes of each appropriation which would be affected. The provisions of this section also fail to recognize a possible need for a thorough study of revenues and receipts with the view that such action as may be required might be taken by increasing income rather than by decreasing appropriations.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD,
Under Secretary.

Since this report was written, the bill was amended somewhat on the floor of the Senate Saturday. Even as so amended, however, it does not meet entirely the points raised in this report. I am therefore asking Mr. Carl Sapp, of this Department, to deliver the above letter and discuss it with you.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
June 6, 1946.

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of June 4 asking for our views on sections 130 and 208 of the legislative reorganization bill, S. 2177.

The purposes of the Legislative Reorganization bill as a whole are thoroughly laudable and its effects in equipping the Senate and the House of Representatives to discharge their obligations are badly needed.

The purpose of sections 130 and 208 is apparently to insure more systematic over-all consideration of the Government's total program—less piecemeal legislation and especially more recognition of the fact that revenue policies and expenditure policies are closely related in their economic consequences. This also is a laudable purpose which I have urged repeatedly.

But the specific terms of these two sections seem to conflict with the well-considered provisions of the Employment Act of 1946 and furthermore it seems to me would restrict and hamper rather than encourage the development of a unified and enlightened economic program.

Section 130 calls for a joint committee report by April 15 of each year setting forth estimates of both revenue and expenditures for the next fiscal year and would prevent the consideration of any appropriation bill until both Houses had adopted a concurrent resolution with respect to the Federal debt limitation. This concurrent resolution might require weeks of debate, and thus make for hasty consideration of the revenue bills themselves.

It seems impossible for the other working committees of the two Houses to have their work in shape as early as April 15th so that the Appropriation and Finance committees of the Senate and the Appropriations and

the Ways and Means committees of the House could formulate intelligent estimates. This April 15th report would either conflict with or be superseded by the May 1st report of the Joint Committee already created by the Employment Act of 1946. If the April 15th report were binding it would be because the four committees on revenue and expenditures had become de facto a super-government, overriding—by a simple concurrent resolution which would not require the signature of the President—the Constitutional powers of the separate chambers and constraining the responsible policy committees of each House in the discharge of their appropriate duties.

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report established by the Employment Act of 1946 was designed for the express purpose of obtaining mature and responsible consideration of the economic state of the Nation. This report will include consideration of the relation of the Federal Budget to our total national economy. Section 130 of this bill would seem to be a retrogression in that it would tend to lose sight of the inevitable major effect of Federal revenue and appropriation policies on the total economy and interfere with proper consideration of the National program by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Section 208 also seems unduly restrictive in requiring the President at the end of each year to make blanket cuts according to whatever ceiling had been set by the concurrent resolution the previous April. Arbitrary action like this might well impede or even defeat the purpose of this bill itself as well as of the Employment Act of 1946. Section 209 would add to this effect. Some more rational and more workable procedure surely can be worked out to establish closer relations between the formulation of policies and programs by the Congress and their execution by the executive branch.

The underlying purpose of the legislative reorganization bill is, of course, not to prevent responsible action by the Congress and the Executive, but to strengthen our ability to take wise and enlightened and timely action. I should think sections 130 and 208 of this bill would seriously interfere with this objective—perhaps even prevent its attainment in respect to economic policies and programs.

Yet I recognize clearly that the committees on revenue and expenditures have heavy responsibilities and that a clearer relationship between revenue policies and expenditure policies is badly needed. I think, too, that it will be a very healthy thing for everybody concerned to realize more clearly what is happening to the public debt year by year. Could not these four vital committees—perhaps through their chairmen and ranking minority members—be articulated with the work of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report? If this were accomplished, then the four committees would be in a position to act promptly on the report of the joint committee after May 1 of each year and thus present their views for due and weighty consideration during the floor debates on the joint committee report.

If something along these lines can't be worked out just now, I would respectfully suggest that the picture might be clearer early in the next session after we have all had time to get the basic machinery of the Employment Act into operation. I hope it is not necessary to delay adopting the highly desirable and important features of the legislative reorganization bill which are very clear and apparently meet with almost universal welcome.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. GUFFEY. I announce that my colleague Mr. MYERS is necessarily absent on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE] and the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Bermuda.

I also announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

I announce further that on this question the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

I also announce that on this question the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay."

I announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda. If present the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who is absent by leave of the Senate, has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is unavoidably detained. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—49

Andrews	Hatch	Murdoch
Austin	Hawkes	Pepper
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bridges	Hill	Russell
Brooks	Hoyer	Saltonstall
Burch	Huffman	Stanfill
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Capehart	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Knowland	Tunnell
Cordon	La Follette	Tydings
Donnell	Lucas	Vandenberg
Downey	McMahon	Wagner
George	Magnuson	Wherry
Guffey	Maybank	White
Gurney	Moore	
Hart	Morse	

NAYS—16

Bilbo	McClellan	Overton
Bushfield	McKellar	Robertson
Connally	Millikin	Stewart
Eastland	Murray	Walsh
Johnston, S. C.	O'Daniel	
McCarran	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Fulbright	Smith
Bailey	Gerry	Taylor
Bankhead	Gossett	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Green	Tobey
Briggs	Langer	Wheeler
Buck	McFarland	Wiley
Butler	Mead	Willis
Carville	Mitchell	Wilson
Chavez	Myers	Young
Ellender	Revercomb	
Ferguson	Shipstead	

So the bill (S. 2177) was passed.

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1458, House bill 6042, to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6042), to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the measure providing for extension of the OPA has just been made the unfinished business of the Senate. It is my purpose to ask that the Senate convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow. We all realize that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Senate, and all Senators are interested in it. I dare express the hope that Senators will attend as diligently as possible during the discussion of the bill and that we may, if necessary, hold evening sessions in order that we may dispose of it. I am very anxious that the bill be disposed of this

week, because time is running, and the measure will have to go to conference and be acted upon in time to reach the President for his signature or such action as he sees fit to take well in advance of the 30th of June. So that there will be some time for him to consider the legislation when it reaches him, I hope we may speed up consideration without in any way interfering with deliberate consideration of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator willing to say definitely whether there will be a night session tomorrow night or not?

I suggest that on the first day it would be difficult to have a night session.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I have not contemplated a night session tomorrow night, and will not ask for it. Beyond that, I think we might prepare ourselves for it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. If we are to work every night until 11 or 12 o'clock, is it the majority leader's intention to keep us here on Saturdays too?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not like to say in advance, but during the remainder of this session I think all Members might well prepare themselves for Saturday sessions if we are to wind up the business of the session and have an adjournment, as I hope—and as we all hope, I believe—about the middle of July. I think we can well afford to hold sessions on Saturday. If we should finish this bill, we shall have many other bills ready for consideration. Five appropriation bills are now awaiting action on the part of the Senate. There is much further legislation crowding the calendar, and there is great pressure for its consideration.

It is now nearly the middle of June. Therefore I think we may well prepare ourselves for a Saturday session each week during the remainder of this session, subject to any hiatus which may be deemed advisable when any particular Saturday arrives.

Mr. McMAHON. May we count on having Sundays off?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I will do the best I can to arrange it.

Mr. McMAHON. I shall be very grateful. I should like to have 1 day off.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator would not like it any better than the rest of us. But we have not had too many Saturday sessions since the 1st of January.

Now that we are hoping to reach an adjournment it seems that we might very well devote ourselves to sessions of the Senate on such Saturdays as may be necessary between now and the time of adjournment.

COLUMBIA RIVER DAMS AND FISHERIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, some years ago the United States Government embarked upon a program of developing the great hydroelectric resources of the Columbia River, which flows mainly in my State, and also divides the States of Oregon and Washington. Prior to the Government undertaking the development of the great Bonneville Dam and the greatest of all dams, the Grand Coulee, there had been some private de-

velopment of the Columbia River. One major dam, known as the Rock Island Dam, is situated in the Washington part of the river. It is a low-level dam. Other than that, there was no other hydroelectric development.

The Columbia River furnished annually for the residents of Oregon and Washington an industry conservatively estimated at from \$250,000,000 to \$400,000,000 a year, depending upon the run of salmon. When the Rock Island Dam was built it was not very difficult to place salmon ladders, as we call them, to allow the salmon to go upstream into the Columbia River and its tributaries to spawn.

However, with the building of the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams there arose a great scientific argument as to whether or not the salmon could be moved up salmon ladders so that the run would not be seriously depleted. At any rate, we proceeded with the hydroelectric development, because the potentialities of the development of hydroelectric resources on the river and the benefits of the dams probably far outweighed the importance of the salmon industry, taking into consideration the fact that we could preserve a portion of it or a great deal of it.

Since that time there has been much argument between sportsmen and commercial river fishermen as to whether or not these dams and developments have actually depleted the salmon in the river. The truth is that there are fewer salmon in the river now than there were in previous times. That may be the result of many other causes. Surely the dams have contributed to a certain extent to the depletion of the great salmon runs in the Columbia River.

The State departments of fisheries of both Oregon and Washington have had a running controversy with the Fish and Wildlife Service, upon which rests the duty of doing what it can to preserve the fish, in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies which were building the dams. That controversy has continued for many years. There are sportsmen in my section of the country who claim that the value of having fighting salmon running in the river, attracting easterners and others throughout the world to fish, represents more in dollars and cents to the potential income of the region than even the commercial fisheries. Some of them even go so far as to say that the value is greater than that of the dams. Perhaps that is farfetched, because had it not been for the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams on the Columbia River, providing the greatest source of hydroelectric power the world has ever known, probably some of the things which we accomplished during the war, including the atomic bomb itself, could not have been completed in the short time in which they were completed because of this power pool.

The Government has other great projects contemplated for the area, because of the ready access to power from the Columbia River. There are other sites on the river, on which we shall have the reports of engineers. One project is known as the Foster Creek Dam, which

is 56 miles riverwise below Grand Coulee. The reports of the engineers show that it could produce cheaper hydroelectric power than any other known site in the entire world. Because of great scientific developments and possibilities of great scientific research in supersonics, atomic energy, and other developments, we shall probably have need for even more power.

So the controversy has again arisen regarding what few salmon are left. The Government conducted quite an experiment in connection with the building of the Grand Coulee Dam. The Grand Coulee Dam shut off all the runs of salmon north, because the dam is so high that it was impossible to build fish ladders which would work. The Fish and Wildlife Service spent three or four million dollars in picking up salmon below Grand Coulee and below the Rock Island Dam, placing them in refrigerator cars, and taking them up new tributaries above the dams, in hope that it would be possible to change the habits of the salmon, which every 4 years for thousands of years have fought their way back over thousands of miles to the exact stream where they were born. That experiment in the 4-year cycle was conducted probably 2 years ago. It was found that salmon could be trained to make that change, because the salmon returned and went over the low dams of Bonneville and Rock Island. They turned and went up those streams. How many of them did so we do not know. Some of the salmon were found at the bottom of Grand Coulee Dam, and, of course, they killed themselves.

But the controversy is again in progress. I do not pose as an expert. I like to fish for salmon, and I like to see dams built. However, I have been receiving a great number of communications. I shall ask unanimous consent to place two of them in the RECORD.

One of the items consists of a letter from one of the most prominent sportsmen and conservationists in the Pacific Northwest, and I believe that he takes a very sensible attitude toward the controversy which involves two great industries. His name is Ben M. Paris. He has written me a letter on the subject, and I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEN PARIS SPORTING GOODS
& RECREATION CO., INC.,
Seattle, Wash., May 16, 1946.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WARREN: Your letter of the 6th, together with copy of your reply to Pete Antonchik in regard to the McNary Dam, was received.

I'm glad to see that you're making a fight to protect the important salmon runs along the Columbia River. I suppose the conservation interests won't be strong enough to stop construction of the McNary Dam at this time, but it does seem a shame that the river can't be developed from the top down, at Foster Creek, Rocky Beach, and Priest Rapids in order, rather than from Bonneville up. I believe that ample power can be obtained from the above installations without the serious effects on the fish runs

that will be created by a dam at Umatilla, and I believe that the value of the fish runs both now and in the future will exceed any benefits from transportation. But if the McNary Dam is a certainty, then nothing should be left undone to salvage everything possible from the fish runs, and these plans should be an integral part of the plans for construction of the dam before any further appropriations are made. The various Oregon and Washington fish and game departments should be a party to these plans, and not just the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, who all too frequently are overwhelmed by the prestige of the engineers or Reclamation Service, and therefore are not able or are unwilling to put forth their best in the interest of conservation.

You know what my attitude is in respect to the comparative values of commercial and sport fisheries to this State, and while we should both work together in protecting our mutual interests, our sport fishery is far more valuable to the economy of this State than is the commercial. No one yet, of national reputation and authority, has given full credit to what sport fishing for migratory salmon and steelheads means to the State of Washington, or even to the Nation as a whole. But I believe that it is one of our most valued and treasured resources, and that economically it returns many hundreds of millions of dollars to this State annually, and not just a few millions as does the commercial fishery.

Many thousands of people have moved out to Washington and remained here solely because of the excellence of its sport fishing on salmon and steelheads. Many thousands more will come and remain if the sport is maintained, because that sort of recreation is an important and determining factor in their lives and where they live. I contend that 75,000 people reside in the Puget Sound area alone, and remain here, solely because of the sport they enjoy the year around on salmon and steelheads, a sport that is accessible almost any afternoon or week end close at hand.

It is estimated these people, ranging from big executives to laborers and through all the professions, earn and spend here an average of \$3,000 each year, which totals up to \$225,000,000 annually, a value to the economy of this State which can be attributed directly to the sport salmon and steelhead fishing that is available. Capitalized at 4 percent, this represents a capital resource to this region with a value of nearly \$6,000,000,000.

And I believe the Columbia, producing as it does much of the sport fishing in Idaho, Oregon, and other parts of Washington, approaches or equals the values claimed for Puget Sound.

And while on this subject, I think it's nothing short of a crime the way the Army engineers and irrigation and power interests and others who are equally short-sighted, are covetously eyeing the lower reaches of virtually every river flowing into Puget Sound and through western Washington for dam sites, under the guise of flood control, power, or irrigation. Any dam on the lower reaches at the sites now proposed will virtually destroy the runs of fish in those rivers, causing a loss that will exceed the benefits to be obtained one-hundred-fold—yes, one-hundred-fold. For example, the annual average flood loss proposed to be prevented by a dam on Green River, 6 miles east of Auburn, is \$200,000, according to the engineers' figures. The loss that will result to this immediate locality's economy on the basis quoted above will be upward of \$30,000,000 annually.

The trouble is that the engineers get some of these professional civilian consultants or touts to egg them on, and it's almost impossible to stop them, or divert them from their original plans.

But in most cases these rivers, all of them, can be controlled or harnessed by a series of dams in their upper reaches above the

range of the salmon's migration, which would not seriously interfere with or deplete the runs. True, they would cost more money, but the added cost can be readily justified if the fisheries were considered and appraised at their true value from an economic viewpoint and not at the cold dollar and cent value of a pound of dead fish.

WARREN, if you put this viewpoint over in Congress, you can be the most popular man ever to go to Washington from the Pacific coast, and you'll be the greatest. What do you suppose these tens of thousands of people will think, whom the industrialists plan to lure out here, if they can find a job and with it, the finest, cleanest, and most readily accessible recreation in the world, that of sport salmon and steelhead fishing? Puget Sound and its bordering cities can really be America's Utopia, so easily. We can have industrial development plus our God-given recreational heritage, if only a little common sense is used.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

B. M. PARIS.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The other item is a résumé of this subject written by one of the great newspaper men of our State who is also a sportsman and a conservationist interested in the development of our State. His name is Gordon M. Quarnstrom, and he is editor of the Longview Daily News. He made a survey of the future of Columbia River salmon with the present dams, and taking into consideration the possibility of further dams. He goes into the subject in great detail. I believe that his statement should be a part of the RECORD. I hope that Members of the Senate as well as Members of the House who may lean toward the fishing side or the side of those interested in the construction of dams, and all those who are interested in the preservation of these great resources together with such fish and wildlife as we can preserve, will read these articles. The controversy will again be before us in connection with appropriations for fish ladders and other things.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONGVIEW DAILY NEWS,
Longview, Wash., April 15, 1946.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am sorry to have delayed so long in sending you a copy of my article on the Columbia River dams and fisheries, but the only copy available was being used by The Fisherman, a new magazine, and I had to wait until I could track it down and have it returned to me.

I enclose it herewith.

Sincerely,

GORDON M. QUARNSTROM.

FUTURE OF COLUMBIA RIVER SALMON RUNS
WORRIES CONSERVATIONISTS
(By Gordon M. Quarnstrom)

A controversy over whether the Federal Government will be able to further harness the mighty Columbia River, bringing greater hydroelectric, irrigation, and navigation developments, without destroying the quarter billion dollar salmon fisheries industry is growing in the Pacific Northwest.

The commercial fisherman contends that the Government's hope to gain added industry and other benefits from the building of a series of eight more dams does not compensate for the loss of food resources and

employment which will result from such a program.

Federal agencies and certain other persons interested in Pacific Northwest development, on the other hand, feel the fisherman's fears are unfounded. As proof they point to what they label as the successful experiment of restoring salmon and steelhead runs which had been threatened by the building of the gigantic Grand Coulee Dam. This experiment, which meant the trapping of salmon and steelhead below Grand Coulee and then starting new runs of the fish in tributaries below the dam, has been praised by Department of the Interior publicists and by a number of free lance writers.

DECLARED INADEQUATE

However, the commercial fisherman, whose very existence depends on the practicability of the program, characterizes the Grand Coulee fish transplant project as inadequate, successful only in the glowing reports of Federal press agents.

The fisherman increasingly often is making the grave charge that various news releases are giving a false picture of the Grand Coulee salmon hatchery and transplanting program.

The men who make their living from the Columbia River's once tremendous salmon runs react like a bull to a red flag whenever they read reports which tell how the stream's fisheries have been saved. And they react in similar fashion whenever they read how some agencies want to build eight more dams on the Columbia, "without damaging existing fisheries," or how various power systems, publicly or privately owned, want to erect mighty dams on the Columbia's lower tributaries.

"Another high dam on the Columbia River below the Snake River could easily eliminate the salmon as a valuable commercial resource," declares W. William Puustinen, veteran fisherman and a Columbia Basin policy consultant.

DIFFERENCE IN VIEWS

It is right at this point that the whole question of Northwest industrial development enters. There are those who look with favoring eyes on a great Pacific Northwest manufacturing empire, capitalizing on gains made in wartime and utilizing still undeveloped power resources to compete with the East in light-metals production and general industrial development. And there are those who favor a balanced Columbia River economy, with fisheries and a moderately developed industrial program, using power from facilities which would not further damage the salmon runs, teeming with forestry and agriculture to produce a lasting wealth.

The fisherman is in the balanced-economy group. And, because he is, he feels that any story which minimizes the dangers to the Columbia's fisheries is against his interests. Each story about the effectiveness of steps taken at Bonneville Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, or any other dam, is another blow below the belt, overlooked by the referee and not noticed by the spectators.

"If the writers and propagandists of the various Federal agencies would tell the whole story about what has happened to our salmon, a different approach would be taken toward public-power development and fanciful dreams of additional towering dams, linked by lakes for navigation, would be forgotten," the fisherman will assert.

GREAT FOOD RESOURCE

When Lewis and Clark first visited the Columbia River more than a century ago, they found therein the greatest food resource in the Nation. The salmon came up the river in such hordes that they took days to pass a mile-wide point on the river. The sight was incredible, millions upon millions of fish returning to their native streams to spawn and start a new generation on the return trip to the sea.

Since the turn of the century the Columbia fish population has been decreasing. A 1938 report of the Washington State Fisheries Department, dealing with the possible methods of preserving the river's salmon and steelhead, declares:

"The constant inroads of civilization have continually worked to the detriment of the fish populations. First irrigation diversions, then small hydroelectric dams on several tributaries, then more and larger irrigation diversions, overfishing by the commercial interests, increase in sport fishing, gaffing of fish on the spawning grounds and the increasing industrial and domestic pollution, bringing pressure constantly against the fish population, have decreased their former abundance. So many factors were at work in so many different ways that the public's attention was never riveted for any length of time on the decreasing value of this enormous natural asset."

STEPS WERE TAKEN

The perilous danger facing the salmon fisheries was brought sharply to the public's attention by the initial reports on the development of the Columbia River for navigation, irrigation, power, and flood-control purposes. For it was shown the reports did not provide adequate protection for the fish runs and that complete wiping out was possible.

Public opinion then forced passage in the State of Washington of an initiative restricting certain commercial fishing gear, construction of protective devices for fish at Bonneville Dam and the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. Dam at Rock Island, near Wenatchee, Wash., and the grandiose Federal plan to make up for the loss of 1,100 miles of spawning streams above Grand Coulee by the development of an artificial propagation project below the dam.

It is this Federal plan to preserve the salmon runs that riles the gill-netters and others interested in the fisheries problems, for the stories concerning it invariably are rosy-hued and encouraging.

The building of Grand Coulee Dam meant a severe blow to Columbia River fisheries, so the Federal Government was forced to take steps to help preserve the stream's valuable salmon and steelhead runs.

Briefly, what the Government did was to build three hatcheries in eastern Washington—at Leavenworth, Entiat, and Winthrop—at a cost of approximately \$4,000,000. Salmon coming upriver to spawn were trapped at Rock Island, below Grand Coulee, and a portion were taken to hatchery holding ponds and the rest distributed in streams for natural spawn. The eggs were stripped from the portion held in the hatchery ponds and artificial propagation was begun in the most magnificent set of hatcheries ever built.

So far, so good. The fishermen were pleased at the interest the Government was showing, but still they remained skeptical.

"What will happen when the fish released by those hatcheries come back upriver to spawn?" the skeptics asked. "Will salmon whose past generations spawned 1,000 miles above Grand Coulee return to an artificial parent stream below the dam, or will they make their way back upriver and die beneath the dam in a great effort to get over the mighty barrier?"

There were other questions, too, as to whether the young fish would survive in the transplanted streams—whether the streams used in the transplantings could support a fish population equal to that which formerly came from the great river network above Grand Coulee.

A veritable flood of magazine articles and news releases for the past several years have given much of the Nation the idea the \$4,000,000 hatchery program has been an unparalleled success, that the fish are coming back in great numbers to the streams where they were transplanted, and that the \$250,000,000

Columbia River fishing industry has nothing to worry about.

Here is a 1945 example of the type of writing which riles the commercial fisherman. It is taken from an article appearing in the Saturday Evening Post, and reads:

"So it was that last season, when salmon appeared at Rock Island Dam, no traps barred them. They were allowed to pass, headed straight toward Grand Coulee. Nervously, with doubts and misgivings, but most of all with insatiable curiosity, the men who had accepted the tremendous task years earlier now watched them slowly eating up the last miles of river. Their actions would soon tell whether money, time, and enormous effort had been wisely spent or paid out in graft to a wise and smirking Mother Nature.

"There had been blueback salmon among those artificially spawned fingerlings. Would they turn off into the Wenatchee and Okanogan Rivers, which had their sources in the lakes necessary to the natural environment habits of this species? Would the regal chinooks rush headlong to their deaths beneath the mammoth man-made falls which is Grand Coulee?"

"The salmon soon gave their own answers. As the mouth of each artificial parent stream was reached groups of fish swung obediently into it. Bluebacks turned into their lake-fed rivers. Chinooks passed their tests like seniors parading after diplomas. No single salmon attempted to pass on toward the seething white water at the foot of towering Grand Coulee. Dr. Ira Gabrielson's experts had gambled a lot of Government money and a lot of fish and they had hit the jack-pot.

"The remainder of the fish," the article continued, "will undoubtedly return as obediently during the next 4 years. This will mean that the entire salmon population which formerly spawned above Grand Coulee has been saved from extinction. To salmon men, it will mean the salvage of a considerable portion of a huge industry. To the average American it will mean continuation of a full stock of salmon on grocery shelves."

When the fishermen read that particular article, they yelled loud and long. So loud and so long, in fact, that many persons who otherwise had taken things for granted began visiting the Federal hatcheries which supposedly had accomplished the miracle.

What they found was something quite different.

The Leavenworth, Winthrop, and Entiat hatcheries had turned out only a comparative handful of fish from eggs taken in 1944 from salmon coming back up the Columbia. If the return of salmon had been great in 1944, there should have been plenty of eggs available for a big hatchery output. Embarrassed hatchery employees tried best to give satisfying answers as to why only 11 of the 70 Leavenworth hatchery rearing ponds were in use on July 16, 1945, for instance. Their best excuse, the fact that low water at the Dryden power diversion some miles downstream in the Wenatchee River did not allow the salmon to get past, brought from the investigators the reply that immediate steps should have been taken to trap the fish which could not get past the diversion, so that the eggs could have been taken. As it was, the salmon which did come up the Wenatchee spawned at the diversion point in a place which may not be suitable for spawning at the time that generation of fish comes back in 1948.

In 1944, the Entiat hatchery was able to trap only 35 Chinook salmon, getting a mere 17,000 eggs. The run proved better this year, but the Entiat always had had a good run of salmon in the years before Grand Coulee, so there should have been fish coming back, Grand Coulee or no Grand Coulee. The Entiat hatchery on July 17, 1945, had only 50,000 Chinook fingerlings, 104,000 silver salmon from the State hatchery on the Lewis River, Wash., and 25,000 steelhead fry. Most of the rearing ponds were dry. Using

eggs from Leavenworth, the hatchery produced 1,213,000 fish in 1944.

The Winthrop hatchery that same day had on hand a mere 67,000 blueback salmon and 40,500 silver salmon fry but had released 90,000 bluebacks the previous May. Of the 32 ponds, a fraction were used for rearing fish. Some had water in them but were used as swimming pools.

A few miles away from the Federal hatcheries is the Washington State game department's Chelan hatchery. On hand July 17, 1945, were 840,000 rainbow trout, 200,000 cutthroat trout, and 50,000 Montana graylings, all in 9 small ponds. During 1944 the hatchery had released 660,000 rainbow fingerlings, 300,000 cutthroat fry, 300,000 rainbow fry, and 5,500,000 silver trout fry, for a total of 6,780,000. (The silver trout fry are easily raised and quickly released, however, so do not present the same rearing problem as do the other trout or the salmon.)

Also nearby is the Yakima State game department hatchery, which the same day was holding 400,000 rainbow fry and which had plans to release in 1945 a total of 853,000 rainbow fry, 1,500,000 silver trout fry, 350,000 rainbow fingerlings, and 260,000 rainbow fry. The hatchery has 10 ponds.

The figures merely emphasized the fact the Federal hatcheries were nearly devoid of fish as compared with the nearby State hatcheries.

A comparison of State and Federal hatcheries can be made on the basis of fish plantings for the year 1943. In that year the Federal hatchery at Entiat, with 16 rearing ponds, planted 62,398 yearling sockeye salmon and 55,950 fingerling Chinook, plus 1,240,000 fingerling steelhead and 8,000 yearling steelhead. In the same year, the Federal hatchery at Leavenworth with 70 ponds planted 876,731 fingerling blueback, 12,459 yearling blueback, 422,528 fingerling Chinook, plus relatively small numbers of steelhead and silver salmon. The Winthrop hatchery, also federally operated, with 24 ponds, planted 66,564 yearling Chinook and 741,350 steelhead fingerlings.

Do those figures sound large to you? Well, read on.

The State of Washington fisheries department hatchery at Issaquah, with 18 ponds, turned out 481,437 blueback fingerlings, 31,349 blueback fry, 891,000 Chinook fingerlings, 379,000 silver salmon fingerlings, 356,000 silver salmon yearlings. The Green River hatchery, with 17 ponds, turned out 252,000 blueback fingerlings, 5,312,000 blueback fry, 1,789,000 Chinook fingerlings, 1,929,000 Chinook fry, 496,000 silver salmon fingerlings, and 315,000 silver salmon yearlings.

OTHERS AS GOOD

There are other State-operated hatcheries with records as good. The two mentioned were chosen because they were the stations with the largest number of rearing ponds. As for employees, the personnel involved in the operation of the three Federal hatcheries in eastern Washington probably is equal to the entire staff of the 13 stations operated by the State fisheries department.

As for the report that no salmon had ventured upstream as far as Grand Coulee, a questioning of employees at the dam site brought the report—heard by a number of men—that there had been a large group of salmon in the waters immediately below the dam in 1944 and that some fish already had been seen by July 15, 1945. This was taken as an indication that fish were traveling beyond their artificial parent streams into waters where the passage was barred and where no spawning grounds were available.

The fish, true enough, might have been strays, of which there usually is a small percentage in any group of returning salmon. A question that arises in this regard, however, is: How is it possible for anyone to make a statement that not one of the adults

had bypassed the tributaries they were transplanted to below the dam? Yet this statement has been made many times, and has appeared in print as well.

MOORE IS CRITICAL

Is anyone besides the commercial fisherman taking a critical view of the matter? The answer is a definite "Yes," with numerous sports groups being interested and with Milo Moore, Washington State Director of Fisheries, being extremely active.

Alarmed over the prospects of the building of new high dams on the Columbia River below the mouth of the Snake River, and on other salmon streams, Moore says that action must be taken now "to conserve the valuable runs of salmon and steelhead trout that will be lost if their spawning grounds are destroyed."

"In the past," Moore continues, "the United States Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have shifted the responsibility of fish protection at such structures to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. That organization has then been forced to make hurried decisions regarding ways and means of providing fishways or hatcheries and rearing ponds to take care of the salmon runs that have been interfered with.

"While statements that have been made and other information indicate that the efforts of the Fish and Wildlife Service have been successful in transferring the runs of salmon originally passing Grand Coulee Dam to tributaries entering the Columbia River below that structure, the number of salmon returning from these transplants and artificial operations is alarmingly low."

Moore, taking the position that the State of Washington's fisheries department is better qualified to direct the salmon hatchery program and that it has responsibility for protecting the salmon runs within the State, is seeking Federal funds for the building and operation of at least five hatcheries on lower Columbia River tributary streams, below Bonneville Dam, and on the coastal streams of Washington.

Men from the fisheries department already are in the field surveying these streams for future hatchery sites.

WILL BE BIG AID

Will these additional lower river hatcheries be sufficient to bring back the salmon runs? Moore says they won't be by themselves—but they will be a tremendous aid when coordinated with a strict antipollution campaign, increased use of Federal hatchery facilities which now are available, stricter control of water diversions for power and irrigation purposes, a 100-percent complete screening of irrigation ditches to keep downstream salmon migrants from being lost, and an improved operation of Federal dam fish ladder and fish lift facilities.

"The problem is a tremendous one," Moore asserts, "but with proper emphasis on the important points, we can go a long way toward solving it. State leadership in the matter is necessary, for the State has proved what can be done in the work to bring back the salmon runs in the Puget Sound area. The State has the men and the 'know how' to do the job. Give us the Federal funds which are rightfully due us, and we can go a long way toward perpetuating the Columbia River salmon and steelhead—provided no more high dams are built below the mouth of the Snake River."

If the Northeast power planners can be content with low dams of the Bonneville and Rock Island varieties, and if the program that Moore envisages can be carried out, there may be that balanced economy which the fishermen want. But if some of the power advocates hold out for dams 70 feet or more high, and if hatchery production is not improved and pollution ended, the Columbia River salmon hordes may take the

long trail that the buffalo took—into oblivion.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

John W. Snyder, of Missouri, to be Secretary of the Treasury; and

Clarence P. LeMire, of Missouri, to be a judge of The Tax Court of the United States for a term of 12 years from June 2, 1946.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Ben Moreell to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for temporary service.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads: Sundry postmasters.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow. There is no Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 11, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 10 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman Samuel A. Pillar to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 5th day of June 1946.

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated:

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Edward W. Rounds

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Harry W. Baltazzi	Albert E. Hindmarsh
Willis H. Beltz	Frederick F. Sima
John B. Cleland, Jr.	David J. Studabaker
Maurice M. DeWolf	William B. Tucker

LIEUTENANTS

Benjamin F. Bailey	Joseph A. E. O'Handley
Donald C. Brown	Edward S. Quilter
James R. Cain, Jr.	George N. Robillard
Edward B. Carlson	Robert T. Simpson
Herbert G. Claudius	William C. Taylor
Herbert C. Ferguson	Hubert E. Thomas
Albert F. Hindrelet	David J. Walsh
Draper L. Kauffman	Robert H. Wanless
Charles O. Larson	Richard D. White
Chester M. Lindsley	Claude K. Wilkinson
Robert D. Lowther	Allan D. Yost
Louis C. Mabley	Raymond J. Zanzot
John L. Maloney	

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Marion S. Alexander	Robert L. Bence
Samuel F. Allison	Charles A. Berry
Robert D. Ballantyne	Robert A. Bever
John J. Becker	Richard A. Bevernick
John B. Behan, Jr.	Aaron F. Beyer, Jr.

Carl R. Brandt	Hugh H. Lewis	William B. Ball	Nils W. Boe	Raymond H. Brubaker	Albert S. Chappuis
Harold Braune	Oscar E. Loesser, Jr.	Jesse L. Ballew	Richard J. Boerner	Jack D. Bruce	Nelson R. Charles
Kenneth L. Butler	Julius A. Loyall	Justin G. Ballou	Philip "M" Bogdano-	Lester K. Bruestle	Robert P. Chase
William E. Calder 3d	Oscar B. Lundgren	William R. Ballou, Jr.	vitch	Paul J. Bruneau	Harry D. Chaudoin
George H. Chapman,	Eugene H. Maher	John E. Balson	Gordon S. Bogusch	Donald E. Brunner	Fred J. Childress
Jr.	Alfred D. Masters	Sydney N. Baney	Benton P. Bohannon	Garland B. Bryan	Howard W. Childress
Arthur D. Cook	David H. McCluskey	Philip L. Banks, Jr.	Robert M. Bollen-	Leonard G. Bryan	Robert D. Chilton
Conrad W. Craven	John A. McKeon	Rex L. Bantz	bacher	Carleton F. Bryant, Jr.	Robert W. Christians
Roger J. Crowley, Jr.	William C. Meyer	Theodore J. Banvard	Robert R. Bolles	James S. Bryant	James S. Christensen
James H. Curran	Bill A. Miles	George E. Barber	Daryl B. Bolstad	Donald J. Buchanan	Aldo A. Cipolat
Prescott H. Currier	Edwin C. Miller	Edwin F. Barker, Jr.	Eugene M. Bolt	Clarence C. Buck, Jr.	Angus K. Clark
Carlos L. Dean	Roger F. Miller	Donald G. Barkett	Robert B. Bolt	Stephen S. Budzia-	Cecil Clark
Orville O. Dean	Elmer Moore	Alton M. Barlow	Robert E. Bondy, Jr.	nowski	Henry E. Clark
Luther L. L. Dilley	Francis P. Moran	Louie W. Barnard	Robert H. Bookhamer	Robert P. Buerger	Leslie A. Clark
Arthur L. Downing	Lee P. Morris	George J. Barnes	Shelley S. Boone	Herman P. Buerger	Lloyd J. Clark
Francis L. DuBois	Gervis G. Morrison	Harold "B" "J" Barnes	Warren M. Boozer	William R. Bullard	Robert C. Clarke
George N. Eisenhart	Glenn W. Okerson	Jack D. Barnes	Albert N. Bopp	Charles A. Bunt	John Clarkson
Claude S. Farmer	William A. Overton	John W. Barnes	Guy P. Bordeon, Jr.	Curtis W. Bunting	Thomas C. Clay
Thomas R. Fonicck	Leonard A. Parker	William F. Barnes	John C. Borden	Hugh Burak	Sheldon Claypool
Cyril Fox	Henry L. Plage	Robert E. Barnhart	Clarence A. Borley	John W. Burchell	Marlow "D" Clements,
Henry H. Fox, Jr.	Ward F. Powell	Fred Barr	Woodrow J. Borne	Richard A. Burgdorf	Jr.
Charles H. Franklin	William G. Privette, Jr.	Robert W. Barrie	Frank Bors	Thomas E. Burger	Blair Cleveland
Severance W. Gavitt	Samuel B. Purdie	John E. Barrows	Guacoma A. Bostenero	Andrew P. Burgess, Jr.	John K. Clifford
James W. Greely	John A. Quense	Charles B. Barry	William R. Bottenberg	John C. Burgess	Emory V. Clifton
Edward J. Greer	James J. Richardson	Theodore M. Barry	George R. Bouffard	Jerome A. Burke	Forest M. Clingan
Charles W. Harbert	Leigh W. Sedgwick	William F. Barry	Arthur E. Boule, Jr.	Charles R. Burnell	Harry H. Cloutier
William R. Harlow	Sam L. Silber	Barton W. Bartholo-	John R. Bouchier	James T. Burrill	Joseph K. Coates
Charles W. Harrison,	Charles F. Skuzinski	mew	Emmett B. Boutwell	Joseph J. Burris, Jr.	Robert C. Coats
Jr.	Edward C. Spencer	Ernest E. Bartlett, Jr.	Charles J. Bower, Jr.	Melvin E. Bustard, Jr.	Lewis M. Cobb
William M. Hawkes	Charles A. Stay	Thomas H. Barton	Robert C. Bownds	William C. Butler	Edgar H. Cocke
Frederick W. Hinrichs	Francis P. Steel	William B. Barton	Edward A. Boyd	Lawrence H. Butt	Claude C. Coffey, Jr.
James T. Hodgson	Paul F. Straub, Jr.	Charles A. Bassett	Eugene L. Boyd	John "L" Butts, Jr.	James J. Coffey
Franz P. Hoskins	Harry K. Stubbs	Edward C. Bateman	William W. Boyd, Jr.	Elliott A. Buxton	John "C" S. Coffin
Robert E. Huse	Crittenden B. Taylor	Edwin J. Bates	Charles J. Boyle	James R. Byrd, Jr.	William T. Cogley
Angus Jacks	Edward A. Taylor	William S. Batey	James E. Boyle	Newton P. Byrd	Frank G. Cole
Norris A. Johnson	Robert H. Thomas	Omer W. Bauer	John E. Boyle	Joseph A. Byrne	George Cole
Charles S. Judson, Jr.	Victor F. Wadsworth	Werner K. Bauer	Ralph A. Brackett	John B. Cabell	James W. Coleman, Jr.
Harvey D. Kermod	Edward V. Wedell	Robert F. Baughman	Richard H. Bradley,	John W. Cahill, Jr.	Kenneth L. Coleman
Frederick N. Klein, Jr.	Frederick Welden	Edward J. Bauser	Jr.	Jack Caldwell	Raymond E. Coleman
Norman E. Knapp	Albert H. Willis	Roscoe H. Baxter	Harold G. Bradshaw	Richard A. Caldwell	James W. Collier
Hugh S. Knerr	Edgar L. Yates	Marmaduke G. Bayne	Robert S. Bradt	Henry H. Calhoun	Hugh "L" H. Collins
Robert C. Knowles	Curtis T. Youngblood	Shelton R. Beacham	Bernard J. Brady	James E. Callahan	Ralph W. Collins
Raymond J. LeBer		Granville A. Beals, Jr.	James D. Brady	Philip S. Callihan	Walter V. Collins
		John H. Beaman	James O. Brady	Arthur B. Campbell	William R. Collins, Jr.
		George F. Bean	Thomas J. Brady	Clyde H. Campbell	Robert E. Colopy
		John H. Bear	John T. Braithwaite	Herbert "B" Cannon	Wellington Columbo
		Jesse Beasley	Roy H. Bramblett	James M. Canty	Willard A. Comer
		Richard M. Beauchamp	John H. Brandenburg	Felix Caracciolo	John F. Condren
		Oscar J. Beavers	Eobert S. Brandon	Vincent Carkhuff	Raymond F. Conklin
		Arvade L. Becker	Donald G. Brandow	Robert E. Carl	Richard Conlan
		Edwin N. Beeby	Lucian C. Brandt	Chester R. Carli	Thomas P. Connell
		LeRoy C. Behling	William V. Brandt, Jr.	Salvatore Carlisi	Ernest C. Connelley,
		Edward W. Behm	Nicholas Brango	Paul G. A. Carlson	Jr.
		Burton H. Behrens	Jack Brannan	Robert E. Carlson	Paul J. Connolly
		Walter G. Behrens	Eddie M. Bray	Walton L. Carlson	Robert W. Connolly
		Ivan R. Beisel	Scott I. Brear	Cary N. Carpenter	Lawton B. Connor
		Roy S. Belcher, Jr.	James R. Bremer	Charles R. Carpenter	Harold J. Connors
		Vernon V. Bell	Richard H. Brewer	Charles H. Carr, Jr.	James R. Constantine
		Harold H. Bennett, Jr.	Robert P. Brewer	John K. Carr	Elliott V. Converse, Jr.
		Walter N. Benoit	Stanley E. Brewster	Billie Carroll	Eugene R. Conway
		Robert J. Benson	Richard W. Briggs	Charles H. Carroll	David M. Conwell
		Reuel H. Bentley	Rollin W. Brigham, Jr.	Edward L. Carroll	Charles D. Conyers
		William R. Bentley	George R. Brines	Vincent D. D. Carruth	Frederick N. Conye
		Kenneth L. Berg	John D. Brink	Frank "L" Carter, Jr.	James L. Cook, Jr.
		Thorval L. Berg, Jr.	Charles B. Brinkley	John Q. Carter	Aurelian H. Cooledge,
		Ward L. Berkey	Kenneth F. Brissette	Kenneth Carter	Jr.
		Franklin V. Bernhardt	Claude C. Brittain	Paul S. Carter	Homer K. Cooley, Jr.
		John R. Berry	Burdick H. Brittin	Robert M. Carter	John J. Coonan
		Robert M. Berry	Ernest W. Broadbent	Joseph Casco	John H. Cooper
		Robert S. Berton	Robert H. Brock	Daniel H. Case	Hal E. Copple
		Fred S. Bertsch, Jr.	Richard S. Brooks	Robert D. Caserio	James H. Copple
		James O. Bess	Sidney Brooks	Jack N. Casseday	Eduguardo H. Coppola
		Donald V. Bierwert	James J. Brosnahan	John R. L. Cassidy	James L. Corcoran
		Weldon D. Bigony	Walter T. Broughton	Richard M. Cassidy	Jewell G. Corlew, Jr.
		Burton L. Bikle	2d	Clifford E. Caton	Richard Corn, Jr.
		George R. Birney	LeRoy R. Broun	Robert M. Cawthorne	Roy S. Cornwell
		John M. Black	William B. Brower, Jr.	William C. Cayot	Gerald P. Corrigan
		Robert G. Black	Fred W. Brown	Ralph S. Cerney	Adolphus B. Cosby
		Enoch D. Blackwell	Frederick J. Brown	Francis J. Cerwin	Paul C. Cottrell
		Frank A. Blackwood	Galen C. Brown	Johnnie W. Chalkey,	Donald B. Court
		Ralph E. Blad	Gordon J. Brown	Jr.	Andrew H. Cowart
		Dale O. Blade	Keith F. Brown	William B. Chamberlin	Jack R. Cowles
		Robert J. Blaisdell	Leslie E. Brown	Leonard C. Chambers	Louis L. Cowsett
		William G. Blake	Philip F. Brown	Norman D. Champlin	Allan H. Craig
		Eugene D. Blechl	Thomas W. Brown	George W. Chandler,	Clement M. Craig
		Ben W. Blee	Herschel M. Browne	Jr.	William B. Craig
		Nelson C. Bliven	Paul J. Brownlow	John C. Chandler	Hugh L. Crandall
		Clarence A. Blouin	John G. Brozo	Kendall R. Chapman	Jack H. Cranton
		Andrew Bodnaruk	Frank C. Brtek		

ENSIGNS

Moxie Craus
 William H. Cravens, Jr.
 Nelson W. Crow
 Francis G. Crawford
 James T. Crawford
 Donald L. Creed
 Alfred M. Creswell
 John A. Crocker
 Arthur E. Crofoot
 Chalmers A. Cromer
 Francis J. Cronin
 Flatus W. Crook
 William H. Crosby
 James A. Crossman
 Carlton E. Crotty
 Lawrence C. Crum, Jr.
 Robert R. Crutchfield
 Roy T. Cucullu
 Eugene P. Cullen
 James H. Cullen, 3d
 David E. Cummins
 Charles D. Cunningham
 Williams C. Cunningham
 Louis Curra
 Nathan E. Curry
 Charles S. Curtis
 Kent M. Cushman
 Frank H. Cutalar
 Russell J. Cyphers
 Walter J. Czerwinski
 Carl C. Dace
 Charles R. Dale
 Alexander W. Dalgleish
 Carl A. Dalland
 Kenneth K. Dalquist
 George W. Daly
 Julius P. Damrow
 Charles A. Darrah
 Charles B. Darrow
 Robert W. Dart
 Ezekiel H. Daughtrey
 Carl E. Davidson
 James V. Davidson
 James H. Davies
 Bernard W. Davis
 Carl M. Davis
 Charles E. Davis
 Charles R. Davis
 Edward P. Davis
 George C. Davis
 John H. Davis
 Paul J. Davis, Jr.
 Raymond E. Davis
 Robert O. Davis
 William H. Davis
 Marion V. Dawkins, Jr.
 Arthur E. Dean
 William H. Dearen
 Charles J. Deasy
 Calvin H. DeBuhr
 Gerald DeClerque
 Donald W. DeFay
 Armand L. Degroff
 Robert N. Delahunt
 James F. Delaney, Jr.
 Richard D. DeLauer
 Lafayette J. Delaware
 Thomas M. Delehaunty
 Frank L. Delorenzo
 Henry F. Dement
 William J. Denholm, Jr.
 David Denison
 Monroe F. Denmark
 James M. Dennen
 Warren W. Denney
 Milton K. Dennis
 Donald A. Dertien
 Robert H. Desbrow, Jr.
 Marcel Desgallier, Jr.
 Donald M. Detrick
 Willard S. Detwiler
 John J. Devine
 David M. Dibrell
 Robert H. Dicks
 Charles B. Dickson
 David A. Dickson
 John E. Dickson
 Alfred H. Diem, Jr.
 Robert A. Diepenbrock
 Paul A. Dilgren
 James R. Dillingham
 Dominic J. DiMatteo
 Elmer W. Dinger
 John H. Dinneen
 Thomas W. Dinsmoor
 Bertand B. Dionne
 John E. Di Pretoro, Jr.
 Robert C. Doban
 Cleo J. Dobson
 Robert E. Doell
 John H. Dolan
 William R. Dolan, Jr.
 Thomas K. Doles
 Seymour Dombroff
 Conrad Donahue
 Thomas G. Donahue
 Gerard M. Donovan
 Paul F. Donovan
 Grant L. Donnelly
 John G. Dooling
 William W. Dootson
 James B. Doster
 John T. Douglas
 Jack R. Douglass
 Richard B. Douthett
 Robert R. Dowd
 Richard S. Downey
 Arnold E. Downs
 Frank "A" Downs
 James A. Downs
 Richard E. Downs
 Thomas R. Drago
 Dan T. Drain
 Murray E. Draper
 George K. Dress
 Kenneth R. Dresser
 Henry R. J. Drew
 Thomas H. Drinkwater
 Edward J. Drozd
 William Dubyk
 John R. Ducat
 Allen "W" Duck, Jr.
 Edmund D. Duckett
 James H. Duffy, Jr.
 John J. Dulhagen
 John A. Duncan
 Larry E. Dunlap
 Charles A. Dunn, Jr.
 Bruce B. Dunning
 Elbert F. Durfee, Jr.
 Harold D. Durham
 Jack N. Durio
 William N. Durley
 Charles C. Dusek
 Alexander B. Dusenbury
 John E. Dutra
 Phillip G. Dye
 Bradford M. Dyer
 August A. Ebel
 Edward R. Eberle
 Harold L. Eberly
 Joseph D. Eckard
 Fred L. Eckert
 Robert V. Eckert
 Sherman J. Edelman
 David A. Edgcombe
 George H. Edmondson
 Irving H. Edwards
 John A. Edwards, Jr.
 Thomas G. Edwards, Jr.
 Edward L. Eeds
 Frank A. Eger, Jr.
 Lynwood O. Eikrem
 William W. Elam
 James F. Elgee
 Laurence M. Ellefson
 James B. Elliott, Jr.
 Luther H. Elliott, Jr.
 Thomas J. Elliott
 Carl E. Ellis
 Neil L. Ellis, Jr.
 William D. Ellis
 George Elmies
 Daniel B. Elmore
 William J. Emblem
 William D. Emerson, Jr.
 William S. Emerson
 Ralph E. Endicott
 Ralph Engleman
 Jack R. English
 Horace H. Epes, Jr.
 Douglas H. Epperson
 Robert F. Erdmann
 Henry E. Ethier
 Edward R. Ettner
 Clifton Evans
 Herman Evans, Jr.
 Jack L. Evans
 Keith J. Evans
 Samuel C. Evans
 William H. Evans
 John S. Eversole
 Russell G. Exley
 Kenneth M. Eyemann
 William A. Fabrick
 John A. Fahey
 Robert H. Fahrney
 Dale E. Fairchild
 John T. Fallon, Jr.
 Roy E. Farmer
 William D. Farnsworth
 Rollo L. Farrell, Jr.
 Lawrence A. Farquhar
 James W. Gills
 Joseph T. Glab
 Everett B. Gladding
 Clarence J. Glauser
 Frank L. Gliottone
 Floyd W. Gooch, Jr.
 Archer R. Gordon
 Grant B. Gordon
 William M. Gortney
 John R. Gossard
 Kenneth L. Gould
 William R. Gould
 Harry Graber
 Philip J. Grace
 John C. Graham
 Max W. J. Graham
 Victor H. Graham
 Charles H. Grainger
 Wallace G. Gransee
 Robert F. Grant
 Robert H. Grant
 John H. Graves
 Joseph L. Gray
 William L. Greager
 George R. Greeley
 Frederic H. Greene
 Robert C. Greene
 Vincent M. Greene
 Marvin W. Greenstein
 Martin D. Greenwell
 Hayden A. Gregory
 Eugene Greider, Jr.
 Richard Greve
 Peter A. M. Griber
 Hadley C. Griest
 Warren B. Griffin
 Walter B. Griffith
 Charles D. Grimmer
 Eugene A. Grinstead
 Albert R. Groves
 Walter J. Gudat
 Allan H. Gunderson
 William Gundlach
 Ernest H. Gunther
 Peter T. Gurtler
 Mayo A. Hadden, Jr.
 Robert H. Hagen
 Robert B. Hager
 George Hahn
 William R. Hahn
 Charles R. Hake
 Floyd E. Hale
 Richard I. Haley
 Chester G. Hall, Jr.
 Robert W. Hall
 Robert L. Hamblin
 Arthur W. Hamilton
 Billie C. Hamilton
 Ralph W. Frieden
 John W. Fuiks
 Howard T. Fulton
 Leo E. Furtwangler
 John J. Gallagher
 Paul M. Gallagher
 John L. Gallahar
 Robert W. Galt
 James L. Gammill
 Paul T. Gannon
 James E. Garlitz
 Herman L. Garren, Jr.
 William B. Garrison, Jr.
 Russell W. Gash
 Marshall J. Gates
 John E. Gayton
 Donald R. Geehring
 Gordon Gemmill
 John R. Gensert
 Paul J. George
 Omer D. Getz
 Robert Giamotti
 Julius E. Gibbs
 LeRoy C. Gibbs
 Jack K. Gierisch
 Ross D. Gierke
 Ray K. Giffin
 George R. Gill
 Donald A. Gilles
 Alvin E. Gillogly
 James W. Gills
 Joseph T. Glab
 Everett B. Gladding
 Clarence J. Glauser
 Frank L. Gliottone
 Floyd W. Gooch, Jr.
 Archer R. Gordon
 Grant B. Gordon
 William M. Gortney
 John R. Gossard
 Kenneth L. Gould
 William R. Gould
 Harry Graber
 Philip J. Grace
 John C. Graham
 Max W. J. Graham
 Victor H. Graham
 Charles H. Grainger
 Wallace G. Gransee
 Robert F. Grant
 Robert H. Grant
 John H. Graves
 Joseph L. Gray
 William L. Greager
 George R. Greeley
 Frederic H. Greene
 Robert C. Greene
 Vincent M. Greene
 Marvin W. Greenstein
 Martin D. Greenwell
 Hayden A. Gregory
 Eugene Greider, Jr.
 Richard Greve
 Peter A. M. Griber
 Hadley C. Griest
 Warren B. Griffin
 Walter B. Griffith
 Charles D. Grimmer
 Eugene A. Grinstead
 Albert R. Groves
 Walter J. Gudat
 Allan H. Gunderson
 William Gundlach
 Ernest H. Gunther
 Peter T. Gurtler
 Mayo A. Hadden, Jr.
 Robert H. Hagen
 Robert B. Hager
 George Hahn
 William R. Hahn
 Charles R. Hake
 Floyd E. Hale
 Richard I. Haley
 Chester G. Hall, Jr.
 Robert W. Hall
 Robert L. Hamblin
 Arthur W. Hamilton
 Billie C. Hamilton
 John W. Hamilton
 Arthur E. Hammarlund
 Elmore M. Hammes
 Wayne E. Hammett
 James R. Hammond
 Monroe P. Hammond, Jr.
 William L. Hampel
 Clemens F. Hand
 John R. Hankey
 Frank A. Hanley, Jr.
 Ignatius H. Hanneke
 Cedric M. Hansen
 Howard C. Hansen
 Bernard T. Hanson
 Donald M. Hanson
 Hugh L. Hanson
 Richard Hapanowicz
 Charles T. Harbin
 Edward H. Hard
 William A. Hardenstine
 Herman J. Harders
 William T. Harding
 Willis E. Hardy
 James C. Hargreaves
 Rudolph E. Harkens
 Edward L. Harley
 Lester "C" Harlow
 William J. Harper
 John L. Harrington
 Eli P. Harris, Jr.
 John S. Harris
 Richard A. Harris
 Walter J. Harris
 William C. Harris
 Glenn C. Harrison
 William E. Harrison
 William M. Harrison
 Glenn W. Harshman
 Clarence M. Hart
 William J. Hart 3d
 Frederick W. Hartson
 William C. Hartung
 Donald C. Harvey
 Robert S. Harward
 George C. Hathaway, Jr.
 Samuel H. Hathaway
 Robert P. Hatter
 Edward M. Haugh
 Chester I. Hawkins
 Gordon S. Hawkins
 Jack H. Hawkins
 Ralph G. Hawley, Jr.
 George M. Hayes
 Kent W. Hayes
 Robert W. Hayes
 Frank A. Hayler
 Robert M. Hayler
 Thomas Hazapis
 Carlton G. Hazard
 Robert G. Hazlewood
 Thomas L. Healey
 John F. Heaney, Jr.
 George A. Hecker
 Robert W. Heckman
 James E. Heg
 Thomas E. Heggerty
 Carl C. Heidel
 Robert Heiderer
 Herbert R. Hein, Jr.
 Fred Heller
 Lester M. Heller
 Samuel R. Heller, Jr.
 Lawrence E. Helmuth
 Lionel W. Hemphill
 James L. Henderson
 Pennard Hender
 Nathaniel T. Henley
 Alton R. Henson
 Saul W. Herman
 Walter L. Hermanson
 Ralph E. Herrick, Jr.
 Kenneth F. Herrington, Jr.
 Albert L. Herrmann
 Dale R. Hester
 Carl B. Hibben
 William H. Hibbs
 Robert T. Higgins
 Reginald Hightower
 Don L. Hignite
 Don E. Hihn
 Ray A. Hilbert
 Charles C. Hill
 James A. Hill
 Lloyd M. Hill
 Robert D. Hill
 George E. Hilliard
 Alvin Hillner
 Herbert J. "A" Hillson
 John W. Hinkelman, Jr.
 Jacob E. Hipp
 Beryl R. Hixon
 Charles H. Hoblitzell
 Nathan G. Hodgkins
 Frederick R. Hoepfner
 Walter F. Hoffland
 Melvin C. Hoffman
 Robert F. Hogue
 Harry L. Hokanson
 James F. Holder, Jr.
 Samuel M. Holladay, Jr.
 Urcel B. Holloway
 Stanley R. Holm
 Jack A. Holt
 Charles K. Holzer
 Norton L. Home
 William N. P. Homer
 Wayne Hoof
 Charles J. Horner
 Ernest R. Horrell
 Vance E. Horswell
 George W. Hoskins
 Robert F. Hostutler
 Donald W. Hough
 James H. Houser, Jr.
 Jerome O. Hovland
 Edward H. Howard
 John L. Howard
 Lewis P. Howard
 Ralph A. Howard
 Robert E. Howard
 Seth T. Howard
 George B. Howe
 John E. Howell
 Raymond S. Howell, Jr.
 Wilfred M. Howerton
 Howard M. Howser
 Hugh A. Hoy
 Herbert D. Hoyt, Jr.
 Joseph Hrabosky
 William G. Hruska
 Leonard J. Hubble
 Don R. Huddleston
 Houlder Hudgins
 George D. Hudson
 William H. Hudson, Jr.
 Andrew F. Huff
 James H. Huff
 Ralph E. Huff
 David S. Huggins
 Albert P. Hulten
 Thomas F. Humphrey
 Louis R. Humpton, 3d
 Howard B. Hurst
 William B. Hussey
 John L. Hutchinson
 John F. Hutto
 Marlin C. Hyding
 John H. Iarrobino
 Jack M. Inglis
 Bryce D. Inman
 Arthur S. Irish
 Charles M. Itte
 Donald L. Jacka
 Lawrence S. Jackman
 Arthur C. Jackson
 Mercer L. Jackson, Jr.
 Donald J. Jacques
 Daniel V. Jakomas
 Ernest F. James, Jr.
 Frank N. James
 Robert L. James
 John Jan
 Robert B. Jarvis

Willard G. Jarvis
William Jeffers
Edward W. B. Jeffes, Jr.
Joseph D. Jeffords
George W. Jennings
Henry C. Jenkins
Lewis W. Jenkins
Raymond T. Jennings
Samuel B. Jensen
Seth A. Jensen
George W. Jewett
Salvador Jimenez
Bror R. L. Johnson
Clark W. Johnson
Donald H. Johnson
Elbert B. Johnson
Gerald Johnson
Mortimer C. Johnson
Perry W. Johnson, Jr.
Russel C. Johnson
Thor W. Johnson
Waldo P. Johnson
William H. Johnson
Robert J. Johnston
Jon B. Jolly
David M. Jones
Edward D. Jones
Franklyn L. Jones
George B. Jones
Harris P. Jones
Ira L. Jones
Jimmie C. Jones
Raymond "C" Jones
Robert T. Jones
Theodore R. Jones
Edward V. Jordan
Floyd Juillard
Otis K. Julian
Richard R. Justice
Edward L. Kahre
Stanley G. Kalemaris
Morris I. Kalin
Richard H. Kallies
Robert F. Kanze
Elton S. Katzenstein
Jack G. Kaye
Francis X. Kearney, Jr.
Gordon L. Kearsney
"C" "L" Keedy, Jr.
John P. Keegan
William K. Keen
William W. Kelchner
Andrew G. Keleher
Lewis F. Kellerman
Emerick S. Kelone
Clair J. Kelso, Jr.
Henry C. Kemnitz
Robert R. Kemp
Andrew A. Kemper
Jack D. Kendall
James R. Kennedy
Robert F. Kenney
Howard B. Kenton
Arthur B. Kenworthy
Arthur W. Kershner
George E. Kerstein
Christopher J. Kerst-
ing
George P. Kessler
George W. Kimmons
Ira M. King
John W. King, Jr.
Myles C. King
Richard P. King
Leland M. Kirkemo
Robert H. Kistler
Robert E. Kittel
George R. Klein
Herbert S. Klenk
Philip H. Klepak
Richard P. Knapton
Malcolm J. Knebel
Frederick D. Knoche
Negus W. Knowlton
Kenneth "B" Knox
Albert L. Kobey, Jr.
John L. Koepsell
Karl B. Kohler
Roman Kolakowski
Steve G. Kona
John F. Koons
Edwin M. Koons
William J. Kostik
Philip T. Krell
Ira K. Kruger
Leo Krupp, Jr.
George F. Kube
Charles A. Kuhl
Roger C. Kuhn
Robert D. Kunkle
Raymond E. Kuntz
Karl W. Kunz
Harry P. Kwasny
Alfred F. Kwinsky
William B. Kyle
Toivo V. Kyllonen
Carl A. LaBarre
Howard G. Labo
Dalton E. Lackey
Frank W. Laessle
Arland W. Lafferty
Thomas J. Laforest
Don E. Laird
Herbert T. Lake
Robert H. Lake
George L. Lakey
Joseph H. Laliberte
William Laliberte
Carl R. Lambert
William B. Lambert
Norman M. Lambert-
sen
Clarence L. Lambing
Lester B. Lampman
Calvin D. Landis
Frederick E. Lane
Gene L. Lane
Virgil V. Lane
Ralph R. Lang
Earl B. Lange, Jr.
Bernard R. LaPlante
Everett W. Large
Edward J. Larkin
Jack A. Larsen
James C. Larsen
Leif W. Larsen
Ray I. Larson
Richard Larson
Vernon H. Larson
Perry A. Laser
Frank J. Last, Jr.
Charles L. Latimer, Jr.
Robert A. Latka
Robert W. Laughead
Philip R. Lauriat
John T. Law
Edward J. Lawrence
Eston D. Lawrence
William Leary, Jr.
Cyrus "S" Lee
Donald E. Lee
Kent L. Lee
Norman I. Lee, Jr.
Frederick L. Leib
Calvin R. Leish
Dee L. Leland
Gideon R. Lemire
Albert F. Lemmel
Ernest Leonard, Jr.
George S. Leonard
Warren E. Leonard
Herbert A. Leonhardt
Robert K. Leshner
John K. Lesniak
Joseph R. E. Le Tour-
neau
Burna D. Levi, Jr.
Aaron A. Levine
Herbert A. Levitt
Francis A. Lewis
Frederick G. Lewis
Lawrence E. Lewis 2d
Mayland P. Lewis, Jr.
William A. Lewiston
Edwin Lieuwen
Robert C. Light
Ernest F. Lilek
Walter F. Lilly
Earl L. Lindgren
Albert E. Lindsay
William A. Lindsay
Edgar L. Lindsey, Jr.
Rowland G. Lindsey
"J" "A" Linn
Robert B. Linn
Sylvester J. Linn, Jr.
Cloyd A. Linville
James C. Linville
Grant N. Lipelt
Clyde D. Little
Wesley H. Lizotte
Thomas E. Lloyd
Emmanuel J. Lobato
Ralph F. Loche
James W. Logan, Jr.
Andrew W. Long, Jr.
Albert E. Longwill
Paul F. Lorah
David A. Lord
Herbert T. Losch
"L" "B" Loudermilk
Eugene H. Louis
John J. Love, Jr.
William R. Love
Robert W. Lowman
George M. Luebke
Raymond W. Luke
David Lumsden, Jr.
Archy L. Lupin
Robert N. Lyberg
John G. Lyman
Francis Lynch
Clarence D. Lynn
Hugh P. Lyon
John T. Lyons
John T. Lytle
Lewin A. Maberry
Everett J. Macartney
Robert A. MacGregor
Neil B. MacIntosh
Lawrence J. Mack
Dougal D. MacKay
Harding C. Mac-
Knight
Donald L. MacLane
Harold R. MacMillan
Duncan S. MacRae
Arthur D. Maddalena,
Jr.
Howard L. Madden
James J. Madden
John Madden 3d
Joseph P. Madden
Stephen P. Madden
Edmund J. Maddock
Frank E. Maddocks,
Jr.
John F. Maddox, Jr.
Robert J. Maggass
Thomas I. Magill, Jr.
William T. Mahoney
Robert T. Makinson
Samuel H. Mallicoat
Walter J. Malone
Martin M. Manger, Jr.
Raymond J. Manhart
Marion E. Mann
William E. Mann, Jr.
Roman V. Maraszek
Dwight L. Marchand
Henry J. Marciniak
Joseph Maressa
George W. Markert 3d
Marvin A. Maroun
Jerrold P. Marsh
John A. Marsh, Jr.
James M. Marshall
Leo J. Marshall
Jack D. Martin
James A. Martin
Paul T. Martin
Anthony J. Martinelli
Walter Marusa
William Masek, Jr.
Charles M. Mason
James M. Mason
William T. Mason 2d
Victor H. Mastaglio
Francis N. Masuen
Walter J. Mathews
Harold K. Matthes
George H. Matthesen
Byron H. Matthews
Herbert S. Matthews,
Jr.
Joe E. Matthews
John A. Mattison
Elmer Maul
James J. May, Jr.
William R. May
Lucas B. Mayer
Damon C. Mayes
Shuler H. Mayes
John F. Maynard
Dixie J. Mays, Jr.
Clarence F. Mazurkie-
wicz
Francis W. McCabe
Arthur O. McCarroll
William H. McCarty
Merl L. McClain
Bert R. McClelland, Jr.
Willis C. McClelland
William R. McClintock
Michael McClintock
Nathaniel D. McClure
3d
Robert G. McCollough
Gordon H. McCormick
William F. McCullough
Donald McCutcheon
Nolan H. McDade
Jerry F. McDaniel
Noel W. McDaniel
James J. McDonald
Joseph F. McDonald
Joseph L. McDonnell
Lawrence J. McDonnell
Wilfred O. McDowell
Edwin B. McEnery
John P. McFadden
Howard L. McFann
Earle T. McFarland
Thomas I. McFarland
Alan R. McGarry
Charles E. McGeorge
Dwight R. McGinnis
George P. McGinnis
Richard H. McGlauffin
Charles T. McGrath
Ronald K. McGregor
Robert H. McHenry
William R. McIntyre
Colin McKay
Robert A. Mc Kercher
John McLaughlin
William O. McLean
John L. McMahon, Jr.
Raymond J. McMan-
man
Donald W. McMaster
Alfred N. McMillian
Charles A. McMurray,
Jr.
Richard B. McNeas
Robert K. McNeill
John S. McNulty
Wymard B. McQuown,
Jr.
Harry R. McRae
Richard J. McRostie
Robert J. McVicker
Robert J. Mead
William W. Meadors
James T. Meadows, Jr.
Addison E. Medefind
Richard B. Medler
William J. Meehan
Henry R. Meenen
Clarence R. Meissner
Earl B. Melicher
Robert W. Mellish
Lewis B. Melson
Edwin S. Memel
Ellsworth O. Mercer
James Mercer
Carl E. Meredith
Edward W. Merkt
John L. Merrick
Charles F. Merrill, Jr.
Emile F. Meyer, Jr.
Herman E. Meyer
Milton Meyer, Jr.
Rudolph Meyer
Robert W. Meyers
Walter J. Michael
Vernon L. Michael
William J. Middlemiss
Emerson W. Myers
Roderick O. Middleton
Thomas R. Myszkowski
Charles L. Nagle, Jr.
Donald E. Nash
Alfred E. Nauman, Jr.
Lyman C. Millard, Jr.
Milton L. Neighbors
John S. Neil
Victor J. Neil
Arnold P. Neiswender
Harlan M. Nelson
Joseph W. Nelson
Marvin J. Nelson
Robert A. Nelson
Robert R. Nelson
Sol Neman
Clifford I. Nettleton
Roy E. Neufeldt
Edmond J. Newbould
Eric G. Newburg
James W. Newhall
Paul A. Newlowe
Augustus Newman, Jr.
James B. Newman
Raymond C. Newman
Fred B. Newton, Jr.
Lewis Newton
Kenneth C. Ney
Benjamin F. Nicholls
Ramon B. Nichols, Jr.
William J. Nichols
Marshall W. Nicholson
William M. Nicholson
Jerome W. Nickerson
Gordon K. Nicodemus,
Jr.
James M. Nifong
Earl H. Ninow
Guy E. Noble
Bernard J. Nolan
Henry S. Noon, Jr.
Hiram D. Noonan
Robert A. Norin
Francis F. Norris
Clyde D. Norton, Jr.
Gerald S. Norton
LeRoy G. Norton
Gilbert C. Nowak
Hendrik W. T. Nyland
Francis N. Oberle
Edward F. O'Brien
Eugene P. O'Brien
John T. O'Brien
William C. O'Brien
Robert P. Oehaner
Henry J. O'Hady
Wilbur F. Offtermatt
Edwin E. Ogren
Harrison J. Olingy
Donald C. Oliver
Ray E. Oliver
Stephen Oliver
William B. Oliver
John S. Oiler, Jr.
Lester D. Olson
Robert C. Olson
Theodore W. Olson
William B. Omchun-
dro
Raymond C. O'Neill
William R. O'Neill
Harold J. O'Neill
John L. O'Neill
John W. O'Neill
Jordan P. Onorato
Leonard J. Opell
Eugene E. Ordway
Ray M. Orem, Jr.
Vernon H. Osburn
Sterling Osmon
John A. Overn
Edward T. Owens, Jr.
Donald E. Packard
Howard S. Packard
Ethan A. Painter
Richard M. Palkovic
Edgar P. Palm
Charles A. Palmer, Jr.

Robert N. Palmguard
 Michael E. Panciotti
 Richard D. Panther
 Robert J. Pape
 John Paradiso
 Warren F. Paris
 George A. Parker
 Ralph Z. Parks
 Arthur Parris
 Joseph J. Paskoski
 Byron H. Patek
 Dee P. Patterson
 Leo D. Patterson
 Reid E. Patterson
 William H. Pattillo
 David B. Patton
 Clayton A. Paulding
 James A. Paulick
 Eugene B. Pauli
 Paul Pavlov, Jr.
 Daniel N. Payne
 William T. Peale
 Charles H. Pearce
 James W. Pearson
 Lloyd M. Pearson
 Arthur Peck
 Henry R. Pedneault
 Ferdinand B. Peik, Jr.
 Charles F. Peksa
 Isaac N. Pell, Jr.
 Albert J. Pelletier, Jr.
 Robert J. Penney
 Romeo Perez
 Terrance F. Perkins
 Warren R. Person
 Gabriel V. Pesce
 Richard L. Petersen
 Albin H. Peterson
 George D. Peterson
 Harry E. Peterson, Jr.
 James V. Peterson
 Melvin F. Peterson
 Robert B. Peterson
 Anthony M. Peyou
 Joseph W. Philippbar, Jr.
 Cass E. Phillips
 Charles C. Phillips
 Chester G. Phillips
 Joseph S. Phillips
 Harvey R. Phillips
 Robert B. Phillips
 Walter L. Pickering, Jr.
 David A. Pickler
 Robert L. Pierce
 Raymond G. Pierre
 Wayne J. Pike
 Frank J. Pittelli
 Milan L. Pittman, Jr.
 Charles R. Pitts
 Carlo R. Pizzano, Jr.
 Arthur Plaut, Jr.
 Leonard H. Plog
 David C. Pohnman
 Francis T. Polack
 Thomas M. Pole
 Josiah A. Polhemus
 Lachlan B. Poppewell
 Austin M. Porter
 Ebenezer F. Porter
 Lorán R. Porter
 Floyd H. Poteete, Jr.
 Rodney A. Potolicchio
 John C. Powell
 John F. Powell
 William W. Powell
 George P. Powers
 Horace S. Powers
 William J. Pressler, Jr.
 Roger G. Preston
 William R. Preston
 Charles E. Price
 Ogle W. Price, Jr.
 Melvin M. Prichard
 Mortimer J. Prince
 Cyril H. Probst
 Clement R. Prouhet
 John B. Pruden
 Samuel W. Pryor
 Harry M. Pugh

David F. Purinton
 Thomas C. Quantan
 Richard C. Quinlan
 Richard T. Quinlan
 Frank N. Quinn
 William J. Quinn
 Henry J. Racette, Jr.
 Jesse H. Radcliffe
 Raymond V. Raehn
 James P. Ragan
 Roy J. Ragland
 Gerald W. Rahill
 Adolphus G. Raht
 Charles W. Rainwater
 Percy W. Rairden, Jr.
 John Ralston, Jr.
 John B. Ramsey
 Fred H. Rand
 Robert G. Randal
 Clinton H. Randall
 Merle J. Randleman
 Charles A. Rankowski
 Bruce C. Rasche
 Jonathan Q. Rasmussen
 Frank T. Ratchford
 Jack J. Ratcliffe
 Paul W. Rathron, Jr.
 Inman C. Rawls
 Glenn E. Ray
 Prentis R. Ray
 Leon T. Raynor
 Donald A. Reader
 William L. Reardon, Jr.
 Earl F. Rectanus
 John J. Reddy
 John P. Reed
 Leland M. Reed
 Sidney V. Reed
 Joseph "S" Reedy
 Frank G. Reese
 Carl E. Reeve
 Richard P. Register
 Paul A. Reh
 George J. Rehe
 Charles J. Reidl
 William J. Reiley
 Max C. Replogle
 Jay J. Reynolds, Jr.
 Norvan E. Reynolds, Jr.
 Thomas W. Rhodes
 Eugene J. Rice
 Jack L. Rice
 Robert C. Rich
 George E. Richards
 Harold E. Richter
 Robert H. Richter
 Calvin I. Ricketts
 Colin J. Ricketts
 John R. Riediger
 Warren Riffel
 William P. Riley, Jr.
 James A. Riner, Jr.
 Harry Risch
 James Ritchie
 Francis E. Rivers
 James W. Roach
 Walter Roach, Jr.
 Earl J. Robb
 Edwin H. Roberts
 Owen A. Roberts
 Paul D. Roberts
 Thomas L. Roberts
 David Robertson
 Joseph R. Robertson
 Wilson B. Robertson
 Walter C. Robey
 Benjamin M. Robinson
 Earl L. Robinson
 Rembrandt C. Robinson
 Joseph H. Roche
 Clifford "T" Rock
 Charles W. Rockett
 George M. Rodgers
 Robert R. Rodgers
 Chester D. Rogers
 Walter H. Rohrich, Jr.

George M. Rooney
 Harry E. Rorman
 Joseph S. Rose, Jr.
 Warren M. Rosengrant
 Albert J. Ross
 Jack W. Ross
 John T. Ross, Jr.
 William H. Ross
 Edward F. Roth
 George L. Roth
 William F. Rothamel
 William H. Roundtree
 Robert A. Rowe
 Ira M. Rowell, Jr.
 Kenneth F. Rowell
 Ernest Roycraft
 Laddie M. Royster
 Fred C. Rucci
 Darrel D. Ruebsamen
 William H. Rumberg, Jr.
 Theodor W. Runk
 William J. Runnels
 Roy W. Rushing
 James C. Russell
 Patrick E. Russell
 Thomas B. Russell, Jr.
 Robert T. Rutzel
 John W. Ryan
 Henry S. Ryder
 Leo M. Sabota
 William C. Sadler
 Bernard R. Sagan
 Frank Samota
 William R. Sams
 Bernard L. Samuels
 Richard W. Sanborn
 Nelson W. Sanders
 Orville W. Sanders
 Roy N. Sanders
 James R. Sanderson
 Pierre N. Sands
 Ernest E. Sanford
 Robert D. Sante
 Jere J. Santry, Jr.
 Channing C. Sargent
 Stanley D. Saska
 Joe M. Saasman
 Howard A. Sauer
 Leonard S. Sauer
 Lawrence Savadkin
 Homer D. Savage
 John E. Savage
 Richard A. Savage
 William A. Savage
 Donald K. Sayner
 Frank A. Sayre, Jr.
 Norman C. Scaife
 Harrell H. Scales
 Harry C. Scarborough
 William E. Scarborough
 Perry H. Scarlatos
 Albert G. Scatolini
 Waldo W. Scheid
 Albert Schellenberg
 Carl L. Scherrer
 Clyde H. Schindler
 Lavon G. Schmidt
 Thomas H. Schmidt
 Paul R. Schneider
 Vernon E. Scholer
 Walter E. Scholz
 William Schubert
 Harry E. Schulze
 Ralph A. G. Schulze
 William A. Schwem
 Raymond E. Schultz
 Harold F. Scott
 Ivan "J" Scott
 Julian F. Scott
 Meredith L. Scott
 William A. Scott
 Edward C. Scully
 Richard H. Seacord
 Philip N. Searles
 Martin H. Seaver
 Samuel D. Seay
 Thomas S. Sedaker
 James J. Seeliger
 Robert A. Seelinger

Robert E. Seguin
 Charles W. Sellars, Jr.
 Lloyd E. Sellman
 Warren H. Sells
 William L. Sells
 Joseph Seltzer
 Richard E. Selvitz
 Julian D. Serrill
 Paul T. Sessions, Jr.
 Walter M. Sessums
 Lester E. Setser
 Ben W. Sevier
 George O. Sewall, Jr.
 Gilbert R. Shacklette
 Charles N. Shane
 William H. Shawcross
 John Shea
 John D. Shea, Jr.
 Stewart S. Sheckells
 Edward D. Sheffe, Jr.
 Herbert C. Shellhouse
 Lewis C. Shepley
 Cedric W. Sheppard
 John B. Sherfy, Jr.
 Vining A. Sherman
 John E. Shinners
 Harold L. Shipley, Jr.
 Robert A. Shirley
 John W. Shong
 Merton D. Short
 Keith T. Shortall
 Andrew K. Schreve
 William A. Shryock
 Thomas W. Shuford, Jr.
 Charles W. Shuler
 George M. Sidenberg, Jr.
 John H. Sieckenius
 Donald J. Siegel
 John J. Sigafos
 Warren I. Signell
 Colin B. Sillers
 Israel H. Silvert
 Hugh S. Simcoe, Jr.
 Charles T. Simmons, Jr.
 Robert L. Simmons
 Harold W. Simon
 William H. Simpson, Jr.
 John H. Sims
 Andrew M. Sinclair
 William C. Singletary
 Richard G. Sipe
 Frank Sistrunk
 Michael Skees
 Ellis D. Skidmore
 Wesley E. Skill
 Charles A. Skinner
 Roger E. Skjel
 Jack B. Sledge
 Allen W. Slifer
 Denver C. Sliger
 John P. Slowiak
 David B. Small
 James D. Small
 Robert H. Small
 Robert Smiegocki
 Walter P. Smiley
 Bryant G. Smith
 Carl E. Smith
 Carl M. Smith
 Coleman H. Smith
 Edwin P. Smith, Jr.
 Howard H. Smith
 Jacob P. Smith
 Lewis O. Smith
 Richard Smith
 Russell L. Smith
 Sheldon D. Smith
 Wayne F. Smith, Jr.
 Theodore M. Smyer
 Robert H. Smyth
 George W. Snediker
 Joseph C. Snodgrass
 Edward L. Snopkowski
 Claire E. Snow, Jr.
 John W. Snowden
 Harold F. Snowden
 James G. Snyder

Richard J. Soike
 Donald T. Soltenberger
 Leo S. Soltys, Jr.
 Marvin P. South
 William A. Spalding, Jr.
 John Sparger
 James Spargo
 Warren G. Sparks
 Paul H. A. Spears
 Billie C. Spell
 Paul E. Spencer
 Ray A. Spenser
 Stanley S. Sperry
 Richard H. Spindler
 Marco P. Spinelli
 Charles "G" Spoerer
 Wade R. Squire
 Carlos B. Stafford
 Peary D. Stafford
 Vernon D. Stanford
 Carleton W. Staples
 Carlton B. Starks
 James M. Stauffer
 LeRoy V.-St. Cyr
 William S. Stebbins
 Albert A. Steinbeck
 Charles H. Stephens
 Sidney B. Stephens, Jr.
 Jean B. Stevens
 Nevin J. Stevenson, Jr.
 Robert J. Stevenson, Jr.
 Clell Stewart
 George B. Stewart 3d
 Hal B. Stewart
 Loren R. Stiegelmar
 Norris O. Stieler
 Leonard E. Stilwill
 Harry E. Stirling
 Archie P. Stockebrand
 Elmer T. Stonecipher
 John F. Stose
 Ben H. Stough, Jr.
 Burke W. Stout
 LeRoy Stram, Jr.
 Robert L. Straub
 Harold Strawhorn
 Lawrence B. Streiff
 Lloyd L. Stromberg
 Riter M. Stuart
 George W. Stubblefield, Jr.
 Roy M. Sudduth
 Howard "A" "I" Sugg
 James M. Sullenger
 Clifford W. Sullivan
 Francis J. Sullivan
 Kenneth M. Sullivan
 Patrick L. Sullivan
 Russell H. Sullivan, Jr.
 William H. Sullivan
 William P. Sullivan
 George H. Sult
 William B. Sumpter
 Robert S. Sutherland
 John H. Suttner
 LuReign Sutton
 Gustav F. Swanson
 Ralph W. Swearingen, Jr.
 Albert L. Sweeney
 William L. Sweeney, Jr.
 James B. Sweeny, Jr.
 Edward T. Swientek
 Robert E. Swigart
 Ray A. Szedziwski
 Thomas L. Tabor
 Wallace L. Talbot, Jr.
 Edwin "M" Talbott, Jr.
 Carson R. Tallent
 Humphrey L. Tallman
 William Tarbox
 George L. Tarleton
 Ben R. Tate, Jr.
 Benjamin C. Tate
 Donald C. Taylor
 Donald W. Taylor
 Goodwin R. Taylor

Martin E. Taylor
 Russell S. Taylor
 William O. Teague, Jr.
 Thomas W. Teal
 Thomas W. Tearney
 James Tenety, Jr.
 Hubert A. Ten Eyck, Jr.
 Ernest Tennes
 John H. Terry
 Charles P. Tesh
 William G. Thatcher
 Lee A. Theroux
 William W. Theriault
 George F. Thibeault
 DeWitt O. Thomas
 Edwin S. Thomas, Jr.
 John M. Thomas
 Sylvester A. Thomas
 Warren J. Thomas
 Cecil W. Thompson
 Guy E. Thompson
 Harley F. Thompson
 John L. Thompson
 John R. Thompson
 Joseph E. Thompson, Jr.
 Robert A. Thompson
 Robert L. Thompson
 Samuel M. Thompson, Jr.
 Thomas A. Thompson
 Thomas N. Thompson
 Wilbert L. Thompson
 William Thompson
 Daniel W. Thornhill
 Ralph M. Thudium
 Edward A. Thuesen
 Norman E. Thurman
 Paul A. Tickle
 Howard W. Tindall
 Bruce E. Tippie
 Richard G. Tobin
 Homer Tolivaiva
 Andrew A. Tonkovich
 Stanley C. Popolski
 William T. Toran
 Francis C. Tormollan, Jr.
 Stephen R. Towne
 Herbert L. Townes, Jr.
 Walter F. Toy
 Bill C. Trapp
 Edward P. Travers
 Max J. Travis
 John M. Traynor
 Charley F. Treadaway
 Jack H. Tripp
 Orville W. Trohanov
 James E. Troupe
 Alfred G. Trube, Jr.
 Ross R. Truesdale
 George T. Tuffanelli
 Robert Tull
 Claude I. Tully
 Charles J. Turner
 Clemons C. Turner
 Russell Turner
 Thomas J. Turner
 William R. Turner
 Wendell V. Twelves
 Francis D. Tyler, Jr.
 Alfred L. Ufer
 John F. Uncles
 John H. Underwood, Jr.
 Richard L. Underwood
 Benjamin F. Uran
 Michael E. N. Vallario
 Benjamin J. Van Blake
 Arthur J. Vanek
 Charles A. Vasey
 Vie J. Vaughan
 Howard T. Vaum
 William H. Veit
 George M. Veling
 Earl A. Venstrom
 Eugene F. Verdery 3d
 Paul A. Veres
 Merriwell W. Vineyard
 Vinton C. Vint

Paul L. Vissat
 Robert L. Voight
 Sherman L. Voiler
 Robert W. Vollenweider
 Matthias J. Vopatek, Jr.
 William D. Wade
 James W. Waggoner
 Adrian D. Wagner
 Harry M. Wagner
 Edwin J. Walasek
 Ray F. Walburg
 Clarke B. Walbridge
 Donald P. Walker
 Earl P. Walker
 Gordon D. Walker
 Grant J. Walker
 Herbert P. Walker, Jr.
 John P. Walker, Jr.
 John S. Walker
 Robert A. Walker
 William F. Walker
 William O. Walker
 Roger M. Wall
 Wilfred G. Wallace
 John Wallat
 Marion C. Walley
 Samuel C. Walls
 Carroll A. Walsh
 Nelson C. Walton
 Lytleton T. Ward
 Rudolph L. Ward
 William A. Warde
 Robert L. Warner
 Robert D. Warren
 Samuel B. Warren
 Orval J. Washburn
 Robert J. Watkins
 Earl E. Watson
 Edward L. Watson
 Guy "B" Watson, Jr.
 Robert S. Watson
 William S. Watson
 Harry J. Watters
 Thomas F. Wattle
 John M. Watts
 Martin V. Watts
 Jack E. Weatherford
 Charles D. Webb
 Warren W. Webb
 William L. Webb
 Boyd Y. Weber
 Robert W. Weber
 John A. Webster
 John F. Weidling
 Jack W. Weidner
 George Welch, Jr.
 Robert E. Wiegand
 Walter H. Weimer
 Eugene J. Weinbeck
 LaVerne L. Weiss
 Carl Weisse
 Glenn E. Welch
 James M. Welles
 Daniel C. Wells
 George R. Wells
 Roland A. Wells
 Howard C. Wellsman
 Egon H. Werdelman
 Paul F. Werner
 Donald E. S. Westby
 Lewis O. Westcott
 Bily G. Westerfield
 Franklin G. Westfall
 William H. Westray
 Wilbur L. Wetherill
 Elwood C. Wheat
 Chester H. Wheatley
 James F. Wheeler
 Roy S. Whitcomb
 Carl C. White
 Dorsey M. White, Jr.
 Gerald T. White
 Horace R. White
 Joseph E. White, Jr.
 Roy C. White
 Donald D. Whitney
 Loren C. Whitney
 Harold E. Wibberley, Jr.

Thomas E. Wiggins
 Frank J. Wikenheiser
 Joseph H. Wilberding
 Charles C. Wilbur
 James F. Wilbur
 James H. Wilder
 Howard F. Wiley
 Eugene P. Wilkinson
 Edward L. Willey
 James L. Willhide
 Cassius A. Williams, Jr.
 Donald R. Williams
 Joe Williams, Jr.
 Joe W. Williams, Jr.
 John K. Williams
 Malcolm W. Williams
 William H. Williams, Jr.
 Laurence B. Williamson
 Merritt A. Williamson
 Charles H. Willis
 Robert S. Willis
 Albert R. Wilson
 Ernest E. Wilson
 Jennings B. Wilson, Jr.
 Oscar M. Wilson, Jr.
 Robert G. Wilson, Jr.
 Alonza R. Windley
 David "J" Winn
 George H. Winslow
 Henry E. Winter, Jr.
 Homer A. Winter
 Charles L. Winters, Jr.
 James H. Wirth
 Eugene R. Wiseman
 Maurice E. Witting
 Fred W. Woessner, Jr.
 Francis D. Woldich
 Martin L. Wolf
 George Matlack Wolfe
 George Michael Wolfe
 Theodore "E" Wolfe, Jr.
 Alan S. Wolff
 Leonard C. Wolff
 Cleo B. Wood
 Harry W. Wood
 James Wood
 John W. Woodall, Jr.
 LaMar L. Woodward
 Leonard S. Woodward
 William B. Woodward
 Stephen R. Woolard
 Amos L. Wooten
 Benjamin F. Worcester
 Charles E. Works
 Curtis C. Worley
 Robert A. Wright
 William Alexander Wright
 William Austin Wright
 Alfred H. Wunderl
 John F. Wunderlich
 Waldemar Yatchmenoff
 Carl H. Yeagle
 Clifford R. Yelley
 Harold Yefemian
 Laurens W. Youmans, Jr.
 Robert S. Young
 Donald K. Youngblood
 Leslie L. Youngblood, Jr.
 Leonard W. Zaborski
 Walter F. Zartman
 William H. Zeigler
 William H. Zellers
 Max A. Zesiger
 Frederick W. Zigler
 Roy W. R. Zimdars
 Irving Zolo
 Gerard P. Zornow
 Clarence J. Zurcher

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

MEDICAL INSPECTOR WITH THE RANK OF COMMANDER

Page O. Northington.

SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Greydon G. Boyd
 James M. Brown
 Harold J. Chapman
 Asa G. Churchill
 Walter A. Crist
 Donald E. Dement
 Percy B. Gallegos
 Charles Gartenlaub
 Robert L. Gilman
 Ashton Graybiel
 John K. Hawkes
 Verden E. Hockett
 Charles J. Hutchinson
 Everett B. Keck
 Robert F. Legge
 Harold E. List
 Robert Mazet, Jr.
 Arlo A. Morrison
 Eugene H. Moyle
 Raymond W. Murray
 Paul G. Richards
 Charles G. Robertson
 John W. Rogers
 Hilton W. Rose
 Shelton P. Sanford
 Robert V. Schultz
 Beryl C. Shearer
 Lloyd B. Shone
 Walter J. Shudde
 Leonard E. Skilling
 Van C. Tipton
 James D. Vleceili
 James H. Walvoord
 Hugh Warren
 James N. Williams
 Leonard L. Wilson

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Theodore H. Armstrong
 Lawrence L. Bean
 John J. Brown
 Virgil L. Cameron
 Nelson B. Combs
 Roy E. Crowder
 George H. Davis
 Wesley Fry
 Carl C. Carver
 Frank B. C. Geibel
 Harold D. Giddings
 Walter W. Gilbert
 James H. Gillen, Jr.
 Rexel Goodman
 Lewis Gunther
 John S. Hanten
 Matthew J. Hantover
 William Heatley
 Robert E. Henderson
 Edward A. Hynes
 Graham R. Johnston
 Morris H. Jones
 Bernard "I" Kahn
 Silas A. Keim
 LeRoy L. Kenney
 Dunne W. Kirky
 Ernest S. V. Laub
 William S. Lawler
 William K. Livingston
 Leslie K. MacClatchie
 Frank R. Philbrook
 Nathan L. Robbin
 Thomas P. Rogers
 William F. Roth, Jr.
 Robert B. Shepardson
 Arthur B. R. Smith
 Fred B. Smith
 Eugene T. R. Stone
 Stephen D. Sutliff, Jr.
 Charles C. Terry, Jr.
 John C. Traugh
 Jack Warren
 Ross W. Weisiger

ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Hubert L. Anderson
 Albert C. Barber
 Bruce B. Barnhill
 Harry L. Barton
 Harold L. Baxter
 Jerome J. Bergida
 Ross P. Black
 Charles G. Bratenahl
 Warren C. Breidenbach
 Robert M. Carr
 Henry R. C. Chalmers
 Loren E. Conner
 Frederick W. Cottrell, Jr.
 Tracy D. Cuttle
 Percy W. Demo
 James R. Dineen
 John J. Durkin
 Paul G. Ecker
 Eugene J. Ellis
 Montgomery N. Estridge
 Claude C. Farley
 Robert J. Fleischaker
 Edward L. Foote
 Frederick G. W. Gugenbuhl
 Byron L. Hawks
 Edward B. Hopper
 Robert E. Huie, Jr.
 Ernest H. Joy
 Philip D. Klinefelter
 Stanley J. Klyza
 Francis P. Knight
 Thomas R. Lehan
 Nathan Lieberman
 Morton L. Lillie
 Allen H. Long
 Donald H. MacDonald
 Malcolm W. Mason
 John A. O'Donoghue
 John L. Pearce
 Robert Penington, Jr.
 Michel Pijouan
 John T. Sill
 Alan G. Simpson
 Hugh D. Stites
 Ralph G. Streeter
 Robert E. Stutsman
 Hardy E. Thompson, Jr.
 Samuel V. Thompson
 Walter S. Thompson, Jr.
 Louis I. Tyler, Jr.
 Frank B. Yorl
 Lawrence A. Whoolery
 William M. C. Wilhoit
 Elwood L. Woolsey

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

PASSED ASSISTANT PAYMASTER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Theodore D. Gatchel

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Frederick A. Allis
 Stanford F. Brent
 Edgar N. Brown
 Forrest P. Brown
 Pierre D. Collins
 Herman R. Fahlbusch
 Frederick A. Fielding
 Charles C. Hiles
 William H. Howland
 Carl M. Jordan
 Robert H. Kuppers
 Harry W. Leiser
 Leslie T. Meiman
 Jack M. Page
 Edgar D. Vestel, Jr.
 Roy C. Voils
 Charles M. Waldner
 Everette M. Williams
 Frank G. Winiecki

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Fred T. Adams, Jr.
 Robert N. Adams
 Walter B. Adams
 Roger J. Adrian
 George B. Aker
 Ernest P. Allen, Jr.
 James V. Allen
 Eugene M. Amos
 Clayton L. Anderson
 John C. Angelopoulos
 Thomas J. Anketell
 John D. Arn
 Charlie B. Aycock, Jr.
 Richard J. Bacon
 Conway C. Baker
 Henry G. Baker
 Robert J. Baldwin
 Conrad A. Barger
 Angelo J. Barsanti
 John J. Barton
 Robert S. Bebbington
 Raphael Belkov
 George E. Bell
 Gerald R. Blosser
 Paul F. Borden
 Roland H. Bouchard
 Cyrus L. Brainerd
 Edwin E. Bramhall
 George J. Braun, Jr.
 Frederic C. Brehm
 Marvin L. Brooks
 Daniel W. Brown
 Bernard "S" Browning
 Lester L. Buchart
 Hubert E. Burke
 Hugh D. Byrd
 Robert A. Carl
 Whitney A. Chamberlain
 Gordon L. Chamberlain
 John E. Cifranic
 Grover V. Clark
 Earl G. Clement
 Herbert G. Cocke
 Paul W. Cook
 Rufus G. Cook
 Leon C. Covell, Jr.
 Donald L. Crutcher
 Owen S. Davies
 Roger L. Davis
 Thomas H. Dawson, 3d
 John A. Donehoo
 Lawrence L. Dowell
 Lee "N" Duncan
 Brownlow W. Dunlap
 Ralph L. Eaton
 Vincent C. Ecoffey
 Thomas J. Emmett, Jr.
 Charles E. Emrick
 Allwyn B. Erickson
 James B. Ericson
 Clayton W. Ernst
 Houston H. Evans
 William J. Fallon
 Walter O. Fawcett
 David E. Fay
 William O. Foulkes
 Raymond G. Frey
 Alfred H. Gabriels
 Olen R. Garrett
 Foster I. Gilbert
 James E. Grey
 James E. Griffith
 Darrell E. Grow
 John A. Hagan
 Louis Hansley
 Norman R. Harbaugh
 Robert B. Harris
 John W. Haskell
 Rolland A. Haisel
 Earl F. Hilderbrant
 Joseph F. D. Holcombe
 Leonard R. Honold
 Frederick E. Hopkins
 Donald J. Hos
 Harvey F. Humphreys
 John T. Hundley
 John S. Huntington
 Frank L. Jenne
 John W. Jewett
 Lloyd O. Johnson
 Mark C. Jones
 Ernest M. Joyce
 Andrew J. Keating
 David B. Keers, Jr.
 Jack F. Kimball
 Robert W. Kirby
 Don H. Kleinhammer
 Gordon L. Koppert
 Maurice H. Kramer
 David G. Lamborne
 Harvey R. Lampshire
 Elmer S. Landers
 Jay E. Larson
 John C. Leach
 Arthur C. LeClert
 Charles R. Lee
 Louis W. LeForge, Jr.
 Harold C. Lemon
 William J. Leonard
 Joseph H. Lillis
 Frank E. Locke
 Arnold E. Lohnes
 John J. Long
 James R. Longon
 William G. MacMaster
 Frederick M. Mansfield
 Thomas C. Mason
 Merlin L. McCulloh
 Houston W. McGlothlin
 Robert H. McIntire
 William J. McKenna
 Owen S. McLeod
 John C. Marshall
 John E. Moeller
 William A. Mosteller
 Robert W. Mullins
 John H. Nuck
 Frank F. Oliver
 Melvin O. Parrish
 Rudolph M. Peterson
 Orville "L" Pilgrim
 Ward J. Rafferty
 Benjamin A. Rhoades, Jr.
 William C. Richardson
 David H. Ripper
 Henry A. Robertson, Jr.
 Dale M. Robison
 Charles R. Ruark
 DeAlton Russell
 Thomas H. K. Russell
 Thomas J. Ryan, Jr.
 Lawrence W. Sadd
 Keeler Sargent
 Charles H. Schmeder
 Melvin E. Sharp
 James J. Shelton

Charles H. Skirvin
James B. Strait
Alphonse D. Suslick
Fordham D. Tabor
Richard M. Taylor
Homer C. Thiele
Walter L. Tholl
Ned L. Thomas
Leonard A. Vickers

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

ACTING CHAPLAINS WITH THE RANK OF
LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Arthur R. Anderson	Bernard J. McDonnell
Ernest R. Barnes	Peter R. McPhee, Jr.
Henry J. Beukema	Arthur F. McQuaid
John J. Burns	Paul C. Morton
Cecil D. Ewell	Karl G. Peterson
John P. Forsander	Charles G. Pfeiffer
George J. Hall	Oswald B. Salyer
Carl W. Herrick	Adam J. Schutz, Jr.
James D. Hester	Edward A. Slattey
William H. Hoffman	George E. Vanderpoel
William M. Kirkland	Robert A. Vaughan

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF
LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Howard L. Mathews	Virgil A. A. Powell
-------------------	---------------------

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF
LIEUTENANT

Earl R. Bennett	Henry J. Fitzpatrick
Arthur H. Castelazo	Pinckney M. Jeffords
Charles S. Daily	Robert D. Thorson
George E. Fisher	

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF
LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Millard H. Aubey	Maurice C. Lipp
Nelson R. Anderson	Howard M. Lloyd
Robert B. Atkins	Joseph L. Mahoney
John K. Batchellor	Eugene F. Martiny
Tom W. Beck	Ogden J. Martyn
Perry M. Boothe	Thomas B. McGlashen
Greer A. Busbee, Jr.	Clifford E. McGrail
Deane E. Carberry	William W. Moore, Jr.
Wayne J. Christensen	Albert C. Morris
John F. Clarke	John F. Mulgrew
Harold E. Cobb	Joseph C. Nelle
John W. Cook, Jr.	Stephen H. Payton
Frederick A. F. Cooke	Cushing Phillips, Jr.
James F. Cunniff	Carl H. Plumlee
Edward A. Daday	Edward J. Quinn
John M. Daniels	Lattimer W. Reeder
John R. Denny	Arthur T. Roth
Edward T. Diberto	John P. Roulett, Jr.
Jack G. Dodd	Harold R. Sandberg
Rudolph F. Duelfer	William L. Sawyer
Leslie R. Fleming	Harold M. Semple
Edmund R. Foster, Jr.	Paul J. Simmons
Jacob P. Frankel	William E. Sinclair
George M. Gans	Richard E. Slattey
Samuel C. Gill, Jr.	Richard W. Smith
Joseph W. Gorman	Victor G. Stevens
Norman M. Green	John T. Stokes, Jr.
John P. Grogan	Gerald Q. Thacker
Milton J. Harper, Jr.	William E. Thompson
Harold L. Haworth	Frank C. Tyrrell
William M. Heaman	Jacob W. Updegrove
Tulon L. Jackson	Charles K. Urlass
Ralph C. Jensen	Kenneth M. West
Edwin E. Johnson	Thomas J. White
Willis O. Klotzbach	Harry R. Witt
John Koleszar	William R. Yankey
Leo Liberman	

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF
LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Larry J. Dupuy
Francis C. Snyder

PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE
RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Joseph R. Horn
Max A. Moon

Guy P. Waddell
Aredus B. Wade, Jr.
Darrel M. Walker
William Ward
Ralph C. Watts
William M. West
Ollie Z. Whitt
Sidney W. Williams, Jr.

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK
OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Philip A. Canalicchio	Richard W. Hughes, Jr.
Robert J. Condon	John J. Lauten
Harry O. Copher	Donald D. Miller
Wade E. Couvillon, Jr.	Ward M. Mortell
Silas D. Cunningham	Aaron Pargot
George S. De Shazo	Samuel Sturm
Irwin G. Edwards	Clyde H. Walsworth
Louis N. Heller	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 10, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. Edward A. McDonough, Chief of Personnel, Division Chaplaincy Service, Veterans' Administration, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, we stand humbly at Thy feet and return thanks for the gifts and favors we have received from Thy divine mercy.

We thank Thee for the many blessings of nature that bring pleasure and happiness to those whose tasks in life give little opportunity for rest and relaxation.

Bless this week that lies before us. Take from our hearts all pride and self-sufficiency that we may always be conscious that Thou alone art the source of all wisdom and knowledge. Enlighten our minds that we may cope with the great problems that come to us for consideration and solution. Teach us to turn to Thee for inspiration and assistance.

Continue Thy blessings to these United States that we may always be an example of the blessing of Christian civilization. Let each of us be conscious of his obligations to our country and fellow man that flow from the rights we enjoy by reason of our citizenship.

Direct us, we pray Thee, to a true and lasting peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 7, 1946, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 360. Joint resolution to provide for United States participation in the Philippine independence ceremonies on July 4, 1946.

MEETING OF EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY
ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JUNE 7, 1946.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I regret to inform you that it will be impossible for me to serve as a member of the House congressional delegation to the Bermuda Conference, which is to meet in Bermuda beginning June 10, 1946.

I regret that circumstances compel me to give you this notice.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 58, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMBAUGH] to fill the vacancy on the committee appointed on the part of the House to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association, to be held in Bermuda, beginning June 10, 1946.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. CANNON of Missouri, which appeared in yesterday's Washington Star, together with certain statements in connection therewith.

Mr. ALMOND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him in Roanoke, Va., on June 3.

Mr. RYTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post of June 8, 1946.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include editorials from the Lorain (Ohio) Journal.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HUBER) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KERR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement recently published in the Philadelphia Record under the name of John M. Cummings, in reference to the great Democratic leader, James Farley.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an essay written by a young schoolboy.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech delivered to the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. MCKENZIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a speech with regard to the terminal-leave pay bill and in the other an address by Major General Erskine to the graduating class of Louisiana State University.

Mr. SAVAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper item.

Mr. BULWINKLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article by Mr. Ben E. Adkins.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter and also a decision of the Supreme Court of Arkansas in the case of Davis against State.

THE HONORABLE FRED M. VINSON

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House